THE PROBLEM OF SANSKRIT TEACHING

संस्कृतानुशीलनविवेकः ।

BY

Ganesh Shripad (Balashastri) Huparikar,
M. A., B. T.,

Professor of Sanskrit,
Rajaram College, Kolhapur.

1949

Price Rs. 12/8/-

By the same Author

Sanskrit

1. An Introduction to the 'धार्मिकविमर्शसमुच्चयः' of Shree Shankaracharya of Karveer Peeth.
2. कुमारसम्भव सर्ग १, with the Sanskrit commentary of Navaneet Rama—Edited.

English

3. Sublimation of Instincts.

Marathi Poetry

4. मधुसम्भार (Published); 5. अभिसार (Unpublished).

Marathi essays on poetry, philosophy, aesthetics, etc.

6. तत्त्वज्ञकवि—श्रीज्ञानेश्वर (Published in श्रीज्ञानेश्वरदर्शन).
7. भावनिनादभूमिका—An introduction to the भावनिनाद of the poet Sumant; 8. काव्य व काव्यवृत्ति; 9. कवीचा अन्तःसाक्षात्कार; 10. निरीक्षण; 11. सत्य आणि सौंदर्य; 12 काव्यांतील सामान्यकथन; 13. सुश्लोकगोविंद—काव्यपरीक्षण; 14. विचारस्वातंत्र्य; 15. सच्चिदानंद; 16. आदिकाव्याचा जन्म; 17. कविवर्य तांबे व अध्यात्मवादी काव्य; 18. आगरकरांचें वैशिष्ट्य. (All essays are published in magazines).

Published by
The Bharat Book-Stall,
Kolhapur City (India)

Printed by
K. H. Sahasrabudhye,
Shree Dnyaneshwar Press,
Kolhapur City.

Dedicated

to

The sacred memory of my revered father

THE LATE

PANDIT BALASHASTRI HUPARIKAR

of

The Rajaram College, Kolhapur.

शुभाशीर्वचनपत्रिका ।

श्रीशङ्करो विजयते ।

मुद्रा

|| श्रीः ||
अनेकशक्तिसङ्घट्टप्रकाशलहरीघनः ।
ध्वान्तध्वंसो विजयते विद्याशङ्करभारती ||

स्वस्ति...श्रीमच्छङ्कराचार्यान्वयसञ्जाताभिनवपञ्चगङ्गातीरवासकमलानिकेतनकरवीरसिंहासनाधीश्वरश्रीविद्यानरसिंहभारती-करकमलकिञ्जल्कोद्भवश्रीमदभिनवविद्याशङ्करभारतीस्वामिकृतानि श्रीभाक्सपरिवारच्छात्राणामनुदिनमेधमानभव्यजनकानि श्रीमच्छङ्कराराधनावसरीयनारायणस्मरणानि—

श्रीयुतहुपरीकरोपाह्वपण्डितवरन्नालयाख्रितनुजनुषो नैकविद्याविभूषितस्य 'एम्. ए.'–पदवीधारिणः संस्कृतप्राध्यापकगणेशशर्मणो लब्धवर्णस्य भव्याय भूयासुः । विशेषस्तु—

नितान्तसन्तोषस्थानमिदं यदेतद् भवत्प्रणीतम्, अजानानपञ्चजनपुञ्जाध्यारोपितविचित्रानेकाक्षेपनिरासपूर्वकं साम्प्रतिकाङ्ग्लविद्यालयीनाध्येत्राध्यापकानां गीर्वाणवाण्यध्ययनाध्यापनयोः समुचितपथप्रदर्शनैककार्यनिरतम्, अमरभारत्या सङ्ग्रथितं, 'संस्कृतानुशीलनविवेकः' इत्यन्वर्थनामधेयं प्रकरणम् अस्मद्दृग्ध्वनीनं कृतं भवद्भिरिति ।

सन्त्यस्मिन्प्रकरणे सम्यङ्निरीक्षितान्यस्माभिर्वाङ्मयाभ्यास–संस्कृताध्ययनदुरवस्था–तद्दूरीकरणोपाय–प्राच्यप्रतीच्यशिक्षापद्धतिसमीक्षा–पद्धतितारतम्य–काव्याध्यापन–शक्तिग्रह–परिशिष्ट–प्रभृतीनि प्रधानतः प्रकरणानि । इतराण्यपि च प्रश्नावली, उपसंहारः, गद्यपद्यभेदः, तदध्यापनपार्थक्यमित्यादीनि प्रकरणानि विद्यन्ते । आहत्य अष्टप्रकरणात्मकोऽयं ग्रन्थः 'संस्कृतानुशीलनविवेको' नाम ।

अस्मिन् ग्रन्थे एतत्कर्त्रा समीक्ष्यकारिभिरवश्यमुपादेयं प्रमाणाविरोधि साम्प्रतिकप्रवृत्त्यनतिक्रमणीयं च स्वीयं वैदुष्यं प्रकटीकृतम् ।

प्रचलितायां चास्यां भगवत्प्रेरणया साम्प्रतिकविद्यालयेषु शिक्षणपद्धत्यां छात्राणामतीवोपकारः सिध्येदिति विभाव्यते । यतः,

गैर्वाण्यध्ययनं सुदुर्लभमभूल्लोके यथापद्धति
येऽभ्यस्यन्ति पठन्ति ते खलु वृथा जाने परीक्षाकृते ।
सर्वो विस्मृतिमार्गमेत्यहह सोऽभ्यासः परीक्षोत्तरम्
केचित्तूदरपूर्तिरेव हि फलं मत्वा तथाऽधीयते ॥

इतिवदेव सुरभारत्यध्यापनाध्ययने साम्प्रतं सर्वत्र परिदृश्येते ।

सर्वथाऽऽलोच्यमानेऽस्मिन् अष्टप्रकरणात्मके निबन्धे नूनं मानवा-वाग्विराजहंसवाहनपुरन्श्रीप्रसादाल्लब्धपितृपितामहादिपरम्पराप्राप्ताऽद्वैतब्रह्म-विद्यावैभवोऽप्ययं प्रकृतग्रन्थनिर्माता अन्तेवासिसार्थोपकृतिवशंवदः सन् समधीताङ्ग्लविद्यापाटवतः प्राप्त-' एम्. ए.-बी. टी. '-पदवीकोऽत्रत्य-राजारामकॉलेजीयः संस्कृतप्राध्यापकः ' इदं ब्राह्ममिदं क्षात्रम् ' इति रीत्या सव्यसाचीव प्रतिभाति । किञ्चास्मत्प्रवर्त्तिते समधीतन्यायसिद्धान्तमुक्तावली-मीमांसान्यायप्रकाश-प्रभृतितर्कमीमांसाशास्त्रीयप्रकरणः सच्चरित्रोऽयं मनीषी-त्यतः श्रीचन्द्रमौलीश्वरश्रीशारदाम्बयोः कृपया सम्प्राप्नोतूभयविद्ययोः फलं, व्याप्नोतु च यशसा जनसमाजं, प्रत्याययतु च नैजवैदुष्येणाधुनिकान्, समाप्नोतु सर्वथोत्कर्षं चोत्तरोत्तरं, लभतां च निरामयं दीर्घायुरित्याशास्महे इति शम् ॥

महानुशासनं वरीवर्ति ।

| इत्यलम् | मुद्रा

PREFACE

After the consolidation of the British power in India the old order in Indian Education gradually changed yielding place to new. Before the British period Sanskrit learning was patronized by princes, sardars, rich men and several Acharyas of Maths; yet private endeavour was the main feature of this education. After the advent of the English system of education Sanskrit learning began to dwindle day by day owing to the loss of the former support. At the beginning of its administration the East India Company finding the knowledge of the Hindu Law indispensable to the decision of Hindu cases encouraged in a small measure Pandits and Sanskrit learning. This encouragement, however, seems to have been given particularly with the political aim of reconciling the Hindus to the new Government, since the Pandits and Sanskrit learning had exerted a great moral influence over the Hindu society. With this end in view the Government established Sanskrit Colleges at Benares (1791), Poona (1821), Calcutta (1824) and other places, encouraged the publication of Sanskrit works, conferred titles on the Pandits and granted pecuniary aid to them. The Pandits were, however, left to their ancient methods of instruction, which did not undergo any change.

From the 17 th century A. D. onwards the European missionaries and scholars who had developed interest in Sanskrit learning translated into European languages important poetical, philosophical and legal works in Sanskrit, wrote books on the grammar of Sanskrit, published the Rigveda with traslations and Sayana's commentary, edited and translated inscriptions, collected Sanskrit manuscripts from the various parts of the country, published catalogues

of manuscripts, attempted to write essays on different Shastras, particularly the Vedas, and published works on the history of Sanskrit literature. It was Sir William Jones (1784) who first realized the importance of Sanskrit as the most powerful instrument for the development of Comparative Philology, and after him European scholars like Colebrooke, Schlegel, Bopp, Humboldt, H. H. Wilson, Roth, Max Muller, Bohtlingk, Aufrecht, Thibaut and several others made valuable contributions to the various departments of Sanskrit learning. All these scholars tried to apply the critical, comparative and historical methods of Europe to the Sanskrit literature in general and to the Vedic literature in particular, engaging themselves more in the chronological and philological studies.

In spite of these attempts of some Western scholars to show the cultural value of Sanskrit learning, the British Government thought of gradually changing from its former policy of patronizing Oriental lore to that of introducing Western knowledge. This was quite natural from the viewpoint of the foreign Government which had not properly recognized the cultural value of Sanskrit and had placed in the forefront the utilitarian value of education in the sense of the needs of administration and Government service. As a natural result of all this, there arose between the Orientalists and the Anglicists a great controversy regarding the relative merits of the Eastern and Western learning and the educational policy to be adopted in India. It was at last set at rest after many years by Lord Macaulay's famous educational Minute (1835) which undervalued Sanskrit learning and laid down the general policy that the diffusion of Western knowledge through the medium of English should be the chief concern of the Government. It may, therefore, be said that Macaulay was the first to lay the foundations of the present system of education and establish the predominance of English in India, though some changes were subsequently

introduced in that system from time to time. The educational Despatch of Sir Charles Wood (1854), however, recognized the value of Oriental learning "for historical and antiquarian purposes, for the study of Law and for the critical cultivation and improvement of the vernacular languages." Macaulay himself could witness with joy how English education was thriving with results favourable to the Government. As a consequence of this wide diffusion of Western knowledge the universities of Calcutta, Bombay and Madras were established in 1857; and in their curriculum Sanskrit was given a secondary place in accordance with the policy laid down in Wood's Despatch. It was merely on sufferance that the British Government allowed Sanskrit to remain either as the chief subject to be studied in the then existing Sanskrit Colleges or as one among many subjects prescribed in the universities, though it had not fully realized its value. The literary activities of the Western scholars above indicated perhaps convinced the Government of the value of Sanskrit as an indispensable aid to historical, critical and philological studies; and though Sanskrit was prescribed as a subject in the Universities, it began to be studied there through the medium of English, particularly from the historical, critical and philological points of view. Thus the Western methods of study began to be applied to Sanskrit language and literature and eminent Indian scholars like Dr. R. G. Bhandarkar, MM. Ganganath Jha and MM. Hara Prasad Shastri, who had imbibed those Western methods, came forth as the products of Universities.

Sanskrit literature thus began to be taught in secondary schools and colleges on Western lines, while the traditional methods of the venerable Shastris, though they had proved efficacious for centuries from the point of view of intensive study, were thrown into the background to the extent of being considered obsolete in English schools and colleges. Sanskrit text-books prescribed in the universities continued

to be edited or written particularly with the application of Western methods by several Indian and European scholars for the use of schools and colleges. Dr. R. G. Bhandarkar, to whom all lovers of Sanskrit must be greatly indebted for his valuable services to the cause of Sanskrit learning, wrote many historical, philological, chronological and critical essays on Sanskrit literature in the light of Western methods, and published critical editions of Sanskrit classics for the use of Oriental scholars and advanced students in colleges. Again, the demand for school text-books serving mainly the philological and etymological ends was naturally felt; and in this case also Dr. Bhandarkar, adopting from the West the Grammar-translation method of teaching Greek and Latin current at that time, wrote, through the medium of English, his two famous text-books (1864 and 1868) for schools according to the plan laid down by Dr. Haug.

As time passed, the development of psychology in the West and the attempts of the Western Educationists to psychologize Education enormously modified our outlook. The principles of language study, which are a natural outcome of researches into child psychology, are now adopted in the West with great success for language teaching by O. Jespersen, H. E. Palmer and others and even for the teaching of classical languages like Greek and Latin by Dr. Rouse in the Perse School (Cambridge). The same trend in education has induced Indian lovers of Sanskrit like Prof. V. P. Bokil to employ those principles in the teaching of a similar classical language like Sanskrit. Obviously the so-called Direct Method of teaching Sanskrit is an imitation of the up-to-date methods of teaching classical languages in the West, just as Dr. Bhandarkar's Grammar-translation method was also an imitation of the Classical Method current in Europe eighty-five years ago. There is nothing wrong in 'imitation' if it is not blind and if things imitated are good. On the other hand, according to the modern psycho-

logical principles of education 'imitation' is a powerful factor in the learning process. When all our endeavours to improve education have proceeded up to this time on Western lines, it is but natural that Indian Educationists should try to improve the teaching of Sanskrit mainly along the lines indicated by Western scholars of classical languages. Prof. Bokil and others have found in the light of psychology and considerable experience that the Conversational or Direct Method of teaching Sanskrit in schools, if adopted with some modifications, will achieve results more satisfactory than those achieved by the Grammar-translation method. But in spite of some good features of this method the general adoption of it is not as yet recommended. These advocates of the New Method are now dimly beginning to realize the merits of the Shastri Method and acknowledge that a few features of the latter are in consonance with the modern principles of language-study. Yet, to rest satisfied merely with what the Western scholars have done for us as regards the methods of study and teaching would be insufficient. It is high time now to show in detail the definite points of similarity between the Eastern and Western methods, and carry on further researches so as to trace the former as recorded in Sanskrit literature or handed down by oral tradition.

The present work is a modest attempt to demonstrate this fact. The detailed table of contents and the Conclusion (Section XVIII, Pp. 531-544) of my comprehensive essay on ' Hindu Methodology ' are calculated to give an adequate idea of the nature and scope of my work. I may, therefore, briefly state here that I have adopted throughout the work a comparative view of the Eastern and Western methodology and of the theories of both about language, bringing out at many places their psychological, philosophical, aesthetic and educational implications. The speciality, if any, of the present attempt may not lie merely in the reproduction of

the ancient and modern principles, but lies, perhaps, in the exploration of untrodden paths and harmonization of the Eastern and Western thoughts for the purpose of placing the reformed teaching of Sanskrit in schools and colleges on a sounder and permanent basis.

This work was undertaken by me in 1937 when I was teaching Methods in Sanskrit to B. T. students in the S. M. T. T. College, Kolhapur. At that time an idea struck me that the modern methods of teaching Sanskrit language and literature bore the semblance of the खण्डान्वय method actually employed in Sanskrit commentaries. I was reminded of an unpublished Sanskrit commentary (on the कुमारसम्भव) which had employed the खण्डान्वय method. The use of this manuscript in our possession was recommended to me at the elementary stage by my revered father at whose feet I had the proud privilege of learning Sanskrit literature and Shastras. To my surprise I found that the Sanskrit questions and answers used in the New Method of teaching Sanskrit literature were just like those in the above-mentioned commentary. I then searched for other published or unpublished commentaries (of the खण्डान्वय type) on other Sanskrit Classics and discovered that this method had been much in vogue before मल्लिनाथ, who followed the दण्डान्वय. This खण्डान्वय method, I thought, might not have been so widely recorded in Sanskrit literature, unless it had been actually employed in oral teaching in ancient times. I then began to search for the theoretical basis of this method in the Sanskrit Shastras and literature and came to the conclusion that it had been strongly backed up by the amalgamated theories of पद, वाक्य and प्रमाण, and that there had existed in the Hindu Shastras a sound, consistent and universal methodology, which would compare favourably with the Western methodology. I was also backed up by the details

of the precious Shastric traditions handed down to me by oral transmission. For my special purpose I ransacked the extensive written material available to me in the printed or manuscript form on the Shastras like the व्याकरण, न्याय, मीमांसा, साहित्य and वेदान्त. It is needless to say here that I availed myself also of notable works in English on psychology, language-learning and other relevant subjects, and that I utilized a considerable time to arrive at the above conclusions. I then published a Sanskrit questionnaire on the Problem of Sanskrit Teaching and sent it to many Sanskrit scholars all over India for the purpose of inviting their opinions about this problem. It however met with a scanty response. I then contributed some Sanskrit essays to Sanskrit periodicals, expressing my settled views on this problem and desiring to know how far my harmonization of the Eastern and Western principles would appeal to the old-typed Shastris. To my great satisfaction I found that they appealed to many notable Shastris and modern scholars. But realizing that the circulation of Sanskrit periodicals was limited and that the English medium would have a wider appeal I set myself to the task of writing in English, and contributed a few articles to English periodicals. All those Sanskrit and English essays with an extensive additional matter have been embodied in the present work, the major portion of which, however, has not been published anywhere.

It will thus be noticed that though I began with investigations into the methods of Sanskrit teaching current in Training Colleges, I had to widen the scope of my work in the light of my experience in the Arts College. I, therefore, concentrated myself upon the wider problem of Sanskrit studies both in Arts and Training Colleges and also upon the higher Western methods of investigation, viz., the historical, comparative, philological, and critical or scientific methods that have engaged the attention of Sanskrit scholars

in the East as well as the West. I think that those Western methods, though good in some respects, have their own limitations and that the traditional methods of the Shastris, notwithstanding a few flaws in them, are well worthy of the appreciative notice of modern scholars. Being brought up in the Shastric traditions I deplore their decay caused by political circumstances and their undeserved condemnation by some modern scholars. I am of humble opinion that a happy combination of the best parts of the Eastern and Western methods in the study and teaching of Sanskrit will ensure better results in future. I have thus made my work comprehensive by devoting my attention not only to the methods of teaching Sanskrit at the initial stage, but also to those at the higher stage; for, I think that there is organic unity in the study and teaching of Sanskrit at all the stages. This is the reason why in the present work the portion dealing with the theoretical basis of methods or general methodology (Parts I & II) is much larger than that dealing with the practice of teaching (Parts I & III). The treatment of the latter, which embodies my practical experience of many years, is, however, full and quite adequate to the requirements of students under training. The present work is, therefore calculated to be useful not only to B. T. students but also to the students of higher classes in Arts Colleges and to all general readers interested in Sanskrit. The future will decide how far this humble attempt of mine will be appreciated by the custodians of Sanskrit learning. It will not, however, be unbecoming to seek their pleasure in the apt words of Kalidasa : 'आ परितोषाद्विदुषां न साधु मन्ये प्रयोगविज्ञानम् '. It is now many years since I began this labour of love, and it is purely by the grace of the Almighty that I could perseveringly come to the end of the projected task in spite of the unforeseen calamities in my life during this period. I shall feel myself amply rewarded, if my labour in

any way proves instrumental to the rejuvenation and popularization of the study of Sanskrit.

The Sanskrit Section (Part I) in my work, it is hoped, will appeal to Shastris and modern Sanskrit scholars, and the English Section (Parts II & III) to all readers knowing English. It may be noted here that the English Section is not the translation of, but is complementary to, the Sanskrit Section, as the same vein of thought runs through the whole work. The Sanskrit medium in this work is partly adopted by me with no other motive than that of bringing the Pandits, not knowing English, into line with the modern trends of Sanskrit studies. Moreover, the literary history of India indicates that Sanskrit has been recognized up to the present day by scholars as a fit medium for recording their valuable and permanent thoughts. It is my humble opinion that in free India, where English is losing ground, Sanskrit, the immortal speech (अमरभारती), will and should resume its former prominent position as a fit medium for conveying important thoughts at least to the learned public all over India, though not as the lingua franca of India. Dr. F. W. Thomas says: "I, therefore, do not feel that the idea of Sanskrit (in a further simplified form) resuming its place as a common literary medium for India is a hopelessly lost cause." I also wish that in the teaching of Sanskrit at all the stages the medium of instruction should be Sanskrit as well as the mother-tongue. I, however, think that the international importance of English should not be minimized.

It is now my pleasant duty to express my heartfelt obligations to all persons concerned with the progress of my work. In the first place, I heartily express my indebtedness to all the authors and editors whose works and publications I have consulted. I owe a deep debt of gratitude to His Holiness the Jagadguru Shree Vidya-Shankar-Bharati Swami of Karweer Peeth, who has graciously recorded his blessings for this work and at whose revered feet I had the

proud privilege of learning works on the Nyaya and the Meemansa. I have been laid under heavy obligations by my Guru-bandhus Rao Bahadur B. I. Powar and Raja-Vaidya Shankarrao Jagtap, who gave me immense solace during my hard times, and who, realizing the importance of my work, urged me on to progress. Had Rao Bahadur Powar not insisted on me, this work might not have seen the light of day. I am, however, grieved at the sad demise of Raja-Vaidya Shankarrao who could not see my work in the present form. I cannot but mention the devoted indefatigability of my dear brother, Mr. Govindrao, in the publication of my work, though thanking him for this would be thanking myself. I am greatly indebted to Principal Dr. A. G. Pawar of the Rajaram College for his keen interest in my work and for what he has done for me. I am equally indebted to the Committee for Patronage to Authors and the Kolhapur Government for sanctioning substantial pecuniary aid to this publication. I sincerely thank Rao Bahadur Dr. S. K. Belvalkar (Poona) for kindly allowing me to quote a few extracts from the 'Poona Sanskrit College : Prospectus' published by him. My sincere thanks are due to Principal K. S. Vakil, Principal B. H. Khardekar, Principal Dr. A. C. Bose, MM. Principal V. V. Mirashi, Pandit Khuperkar Shastri, Dr. A. N. Upadhye, Dr. R. C. Shrikhande, Mr. N. G. Panditrao, Mr. V. S. Aiyar and many other persons for their hearty sympathy and helpful suggestions. I sincerely thank Mr. R. V. Diwan of the Bharat Book-Stall, Kolhapur, for gladly undertaking the publication of this book. In conclusion, I cannot fail to thank Mr. K. H. Sahasrabudhye and his staff at Shree Dnyaneshwar Press, Kolhapur, for their promptness and cordiality.

Kolhapur,
6th December 1948 } G. S. Huparikar.

Contents

Part I–Sanskrit Section.

prose and poetry-Aim of teaching poetry-Qualifications of the teacher of poetry-'Questions' versus 'lecturing' and emotional teaching versus intellectual teaching-खण्डान्वय method stressed-Approach of Shastris to poetry-Figures of speech-Propriety of metres-Teaching of dramas-Methods of analysis and synthesis-Psychological synthesis is the best approach-Limitations of the historical approach to poetry.

pp. 34-49.

VII पाठादर्शः। The practical procedure to be followed in a lesson on poetry. pp. 49-56.

VIII शब्दशक्तिग्रहः। The significance of words-The eight principles of language-study unanimously recognized by the Shastras like व्याकरण (पद), मीमांसा (वाक्य) and न्याय (प्रमाण):- (a) Grammar, (b) Comparison, (c) Dictionary, (d) Statement of a trustworthy person, (e) Usage of elders, (f) Supplementary statement, (g) Explanation or Commentary and (h) Contiguity of words.

(a) **Grammar**: Its teaching based by the Shastris on the Nominal structure of Sanskrit language-कारक (case-relation) and compounds more important than the finite verb and etymology-The Nominal order of grammatical topics followed by various grammarians since the time of पाणिनि. (e) **Usage of elders**: The principles underlying the Conversational Method of the West anticipated by the Hindu schools of thought. (g) **Explanation or commentary**: Gradual development of the methods of exposition since the Vedic times traced-Those methods are embodied in the oral explanation and written explanation or commentaries-Varieties of commentary literature-Organization of knowledge into commentary literature-Common features (पद, वाक्य, प्रमाण) of methodology in Shastras-Oral tradition of the methods of exposition traced-Commentaries are the written evidence of the oral methods-Oral work stressed in ancient

times-Correct pronunciation-Mythological allusions-Sacrificial lore-Vedic literature-निघण्टु-Concrete examples and experimental knowledge-Questions and answers-खण्डान्वय-वेदाङ्गs-संहितापाठ and पदपाठ-प्रातिशाख्यs-यास्क's निरुक्त and its method-Expansion and condensation of knowledge-सूत्र literature and its style-Development of later commentary literature and various branches of Shastras from सूत्र works-Method of questions and answers prominent in some भाष्यs-Combination of पद, वाक्य and प्रमाण in the commentary literature-General applicability of the sciences of Grammar and Logic-Comparative outlook in the study of Shastras-Organization and synthesis of the general linguistic principles of पद, वाक्य and प्रमाण lead to methodology-Adoption of this methodology by the आलङ्कारिकs-Theory and Practice-Practical application of these principles to the methods of exposition-तन्त्रयुक्तिs-अन्वयव्यतिरेक-Inclusion of all the seven modes of शक्तिग्रह in the commentary literature-प्रमाणs-Necessity of studying the commentaries from the view-point of methodology-This methodology applicable to the study of Shastras and poetry-Organization of this methodology for further use in teaching. pp. 56-92.

Part II-English Section
Theory

I THE CLASSICS *VERSUS* THE MODERN SUBJECTS: The place of Sanskrit in the University curriculum vindicated from the cultural, utilitarian and psychological points of view. pp. 93-113.

II HINDU METHODOLOGY OF EDUCATION:

[Eighteen sections dealing with a comprehensive survey of the ancient Hindu methodology embedded in the व्याकरण, मीमांसा, न्याय, वेदान्त and साहित्य.]

i GENERAL: Necessity of preserving the best traditions of the past–A survey of the oral methods adopted by the Shastris–Literature and Grammar–Psychological aspects of memorizing–Conversational lessons at the initial stage–Stress on case-relations and compounds in the teaching of grammar–Eight modes of learning the import of words–Usage of elders akin to the Direct Method–A summary of the linguistic principles of the Hindus–Gradation in the teaching of literature–Four अनुबन्धs–Pupils' point of view–Herbartian steps and formal steps of the Hindu Shastras–The analytico-synthetic aspect of the Hindu methods–The role of Hindu Logic (न्याय) in the development of analytico-synthetic methods–The deductive-inductive process in the Hindu syllogism–Categories, the law of causal relation, Enumeration, Definition and Examination helpful in the development of methodology. pp. 113–125.

ii THE PSYCHOLOGICAL METHOD: Logic aided by psychology in the development of methodology–An outline of Hindu psychology–Its comparison with the Western psychology–Its relation to Philosophy–The tenets of group psychology in भरत's science of dramaturgy–These tenets useful in awakening interest in the audience–भरत's theory of रस–McDougall and भरत–Psychological and Philosophical aspect of the theory of रस–भरत's five Junctures in a drama and their application to teaching–रस theory and its application to literature–The chief features of methodology found in भरत's नाट्यशास्त्र–The subject-object relation and the

enhancement of रस–All these principles applicable to the teaching of literature. pp. 126-155.

iii THE METHODS OF LOGIC (न्याय): The distinction between the Psychological and Logical methods-The psychological method more suited to the learning process of a child-Analytico-synthetic aspect of the complete method-Cognition and valid knowledge prominent in Logic-Means of valid knowledge and the attainment of Truth-Scientific theory of method or methodology is a part of Logic-The processes of analysis and synthesis-Deduction and Induction-Scientific explanation-Development of a system or Shastra-Causal relation-The chief features of methodology-Rules of method laid down by Descartes-Comparison of the Western and Indian Logic-Indian Logic, a science of general application-The dialectic method and the Hindu syllogism-Prominence of प्रमाणs in the Hindu Logic-Categories of the वैशेषिकs and साङ्ख्यs-Hindu theory of causal relation [illegible]-व्याप्ति and deductive-inductive inference in Hindu Logic-भूयोदर्शन, व्याप्तिग्रहोपाय and Induction-Scientific and critical methods in the Hindu Shastras. pp. 155-183.

iv THE COMMON LITERARY FORMS SUITED TO METHODOLOGY: आकरग्रन्थs, वादग्रन्थ and प्रकरणग्रन्थs–Vedic literature-वेदाङ्गs-सूत्र literature and its methodology-The dialogue method and lecture method in the भाष्य-Condensation, Expansion and Organization-Analytico-synthetic process. pp. 183-188.

v THE METHODS OF GRAMMAR (व्याकरण): The function of grammar-Analysis of पद (a word) Phonetics and etymology-पाणिनि's अष्टाध्यायी and its [illegible]-Devices of पाणिनि for securing brevity-Six kinds of [illegible] or generalizations arrived at through Induction-[illegible]

etymological method and पाणिनि's analytical method-कात्यायन and पतञ्जलि-Scientific exposition of grammar by पतञ्जलि-Categories of the वैशेषिकs, the अन्वयव्यतिरेक method of the न्याय and a few principles of the मीमांसा accepted by पतञ्जलि-जात्यादिवाद-Interpretation or Explanation-Etymological and dialectic method-खण्डान्वय-Inductive and deductive method of पतञ्जलि-Necessity of the partial adoption of the inductive method of teaching grammar-स्फोटवाद and the sentence-aspect of language-वाक्यपदीय and काशिकावृत्ति-I-tsing on the ancient method of grammar teaching-Yuan Chwang on the spoken Sanskrit-Gradual development of Sanskrit from the Verbal into the Nominal style-Chief characteristics of the Nominal style-Dr. Bhandarkar on the Nomial style-Corresponding change in the order of grammatical topics to be taught-Nominal part of Sanskrit first dealt with by the कातन्त्र-The same order of grammatical topics more or less followed by grmmarians up to भट्टोजी-Contribution of भट्टोजी to Grammar- वरदराज's three epitomes of the सिद्धान्तकौमुदी and their order of grammatical topics- स्वामी दयानन्द on grammar teaching-गङ्गासहाय's सुगमकौमुदी and the concentric method of teaching grammar-Teaching of ready-made forms of nouns and verbs-Manuals on grammar stressing the कारक-Amalgamation of grammar and literature in some works-Practical conclusions arrived at from the foregoing treatment.
pp. 188-240.

vi THE METHODS OF THE मीमांसा: Interpretation of वाक्य stressed-The sacrificial cult and the मीमांसा-Systematization of the मीमांसा by जैमिनि-Deductive logic and मीमांसा-अधिकरण of the पूर्वमीमांसा adopted by the वेदान्त-प्रमाणs, the analytico-synthetic method and categories of the न्याय-वैशेषिक adopted by कुमारिल and प्रभाकर-Characteristics of

methodology observable in the मीमांसा–Importance of the interpretative aspect of the मीमांसा–Contribution of the मीमांसा to the general linguistics–जातिवाद–अभिहितान्वय and अन्विताभिधान –A sentence, the unit of language–Five divisions of the Veda–Psychological process of भावना and खण्डान्वय–उत्पत्तिविधि –विनियोगविधि and its importance for the interpretation of literary and scientific works–प्रयोगविधि–अधिकारविधि–अपूर्वविधि, नियमविधि and परिसङ्ख्याविधि–मन्त्र, नामधेय, निषेध and अर्थवाद–पर्युदास–उपसंहार–Three kinds of अर्थवाद–विधि in alliance with अर्थवाद leads to the synthetic meaning or Purport–Analytico-synthetic methodology of the मीमांसा–Its wider application to वेदान्त, धर्मशास्त्र, व्याकरण and साहित्य–Its application to language teaching. pp. 240-283.

vii THE COMPARATIVE METHOD : Scientific character of the combination of पद, वाक्य and प्रमाण–Existence of comparative, critical and scientific methods in ancient times–Correlation of studies–बाण on comparative studies–Sanskrit authors and their works exemplifying the comparative method–Wider specialization. pp. 283-286.

viii THE SYNTHETIC METHOD : THE METHODS OF THE वेदान्त–शङ्कराचार्य's scientific and synthetic exposition of the Vedanta with the help of पद, वाक्य and प्रमाण–Relation of all Upanishadic sentences to ब्रह्मन्, the main goal–Identity. of the Individual soul with ब्रह्मन्–शङ्कराचार्य indebted to बादरायण and गौडपाद–Six तात्पर्यलिङ्गs of the मीमांसकs adopted by शङ्कराचार्य–Recognition of श्रुति, युक्ति (तर्क) and स्वानुभव as प्रमाणs–the hypothesis of अविद्या–Higher synthesis in the establishment of अद्वैत–Upanishadic sentences relating to कर्मन्, उपासना and ज्ञान useful for different grades of people–Three planes of existence postulated for gradual approach to the Ultimate Reality–Adwaita philosophy and modern scientific inventions– तटस्थलक्षण and

स्वरूपलक्षण of ब्रह्मन् based on the विवर्तवाद–Inadequacy of the theory of causation and inexplicability (अनिर्वचनीयता) of the universe–Comprehensive aspect of the विवर्तवाद–The implications of the words ' माया ' and ' मिथ्या '–The idea of माया in the Vedic literature–The empirical experience of माया illuminated by साक्षिन्–प्रमाता, प्रमाण and प्रमेय are the products of primal Nescience–Superimposition–The five ख्यातिs–शङ्कराचार्य's comparative outlook–अध्यारोपापवाद based on the विवर्तवाद is a method of exposition–विवर्तवाद and अजातिवाद–Different methods (प्रक्रिया) of the exposition of ब्रह्मन्–विवर्तवाद, a comprehensive method–जाग्रत्, स्वप्न, सुषुप्ति and सत्तात्रय–Unbroken presence of साक्षिन् established by the अन्वयव्यतिरेक method–' तत्त्वमसि ' and जहदजहल्लक्षणा–Analytico-synthetic aspect of the methods of the Vedanta–शङ्कराचार्य's harmonization or higher synthesis of divergent systems–शङ्कराचार्य's method of refutation and comparative outlook–pp. 286–316.

ix THE HISTORICAL METHOD: History embedded in the Sanskrit literature–Absence of the Historical method–Use of प्रमाणs in the Historical method–Historical truth and literary truth–The modern idea of 'history'–Relativity of the historical truth from the philosophical point of view–Six stages of existence–Time and place, the predominant factors–Culture–Historical discipline or the amalgamation of the historical method with the critical and scientific methods–Causal relation of historical facts–analytico-synthetic process in the organization of historical facts–Importance of chronology–प्रमाणs used in the Historical method–The task of the historian–Application of the Historical method to different branches of knowledge–This method deserves to be adopted by the Shastris–Science of History and Philosophy of History–Superiority of the Hindu

outlook on the Philosophy of History-Shastris, deficient in the historical sense-Are the Shastris uncritical?—Merits and demerits of the Historical Method-Inadequacy of the Historical method in the appreciation of literature-Psychological and synthetic approach to literature is the best one-Theories of रस and ध्वनि in alliance with those of पद, वाक्य and प्रमाण are useful in the teaching of literature and Shastras. pp. 317-335.

x THE METHODS OF TEACHING LITERATURE (दण्डान्वय and खण्डान्वय): Analytico-synthetic methods of teaching—कालिदास, भवभूति and Yuan Chwang on ancient teachers—Explanatory methods of Shastris—The method of synthetic literary criticism necessary in the exposition of literature—Sanskrit works on synthetic appreciation—Logical and psychological aspects of the steps of teaching literature as adopted by Shastris—पदच्छेद and reading—Methods of construing, viz., दण्डान्वय and खण्डान्वय—Their principles and application to Sanskrit commentaries—Question-forms of खण्डान्वय—Psychological aspect of खण्डान्वय—आकाङ्क्षा, योग्यता and सन्निधि—Comparison of दण्डान्वय and खण्डान्वय—खण्डान्वय traced in standard Sanskrit works—खण्डान्वय useful at the initial and advanced stages-खण्डान्वय in alliance with वृद्धव्यवहार is akin to the Direct Method-Dissolution of compounds-Explanation of individual words-The place of अमरकोश and other lexicons-Utility of translation and Sanskrit explanation-The analytico-synthetic aspect of खण्डान्वय—Purport is the synthesis of various parts of language.
pp. 335-377.

xi THOUGHT AND LANGUAGE: Discussion of topics preliminary to तात्पर्य—Upanishadic view about the origin of language—Relation between thought and word—How thought is transformed into language—Language

xiv PURPORT (तात्पर्य) : आकाङ्क्षा, योग्यता and सन्निधि or आसत्ति again explained from a different point of view–'Simultaneous recollection' leads to the synthesis of meaning– पदाध्याहार and अर्थाध्याहार–अवान्तरवाक्यs lead to the understanding of महावाक्यs– Syntactical unity–The views of नैयायिकs, नागेश and वेदान्तिन्s about तात्पर्य–तात्पर्यवृत्ति useful in the teaching of prose and Shastras. pp. 433-457

xv IMPLICATION (लक्षणा) : तात्पर्यानुपपत्ति leads to लक्षणा–The psychological process in the use of लक्षणा–अन्वयानुपपत्ति is not the only cause of लक्षणा–Principles of लक्षणा, necessary for expounding and understanding the inner spirit of literature and Shastras–Divisions of लक्षणा–Mental process in the प्रयोजनवती लक्षणा–उपचार & लक्षणा–सारोप and साध्यवसान-लक्षणा etc. pp. 457-480.

xvi SUGGESTION (व्यञ्जना) : Importance of the speaker's purpose or intention containing a delightful idea–Association of ideas in Suggestion–McDougall on 'Suggestion'—His view reconciled with the theory of Suggestion—Establishment by आनन्दवर्धन of ध्वनि as the soul of poetry–Stress on रसध्वनि by अभिनवगुप्त–ध्वनि, as the synthetic principle of criticism—Suggestion different from अभिधा–The संलक्ष्यक्रमव्यङ्ग्यध्वनि and असंलक्ष्यक्रमव्यङ्ग्य or रसध्वनि–The mental process in both—Examples—अभिधामूलध्वनि–व्यञ्जना differs from लक्षणा–Suggestion based upon लक्षणा–Suggestion and secondary sense (भक्ति, उपचार)–अविवक्षितवाच्यध्वनि–अत्यन्ततिरस्कृतवाच्य and अर्थान्तरसङ्क्रमितवाच्यध्वनि–Examples—व्यञ्जना distinguished from तात्पर्य–तात्पर्यवृत्ति indispensable to the understanding of prose and intellectual subjects in Shastras—व्यञ्जना prominently emotional—Mental stages in the apprehension of the suggested sense and Purport—Location of

Part III-Practice

(Those suggestions presuppose all general principles as detailed in the former chapters on Hindu Methodology, the principles of language-teaching propounded by Western authorities and practical experience. The teaching of Sanskrit literature at the initial and advanced stages has been differentiated and dealt with in detail). pp. 558-614.

V SYLLABUS IN SANSKRIT: (i) The Syllabus followed by Shastris in पाठशालाs and Sanskrit colleges—Critical remarks on the same in the light of the principles of curriulum construction. (ii) The syllabus to be followed in secondary schools—The place of grammar in Sanskrit teaching—The most essential grammatical portions to be studied at the school stage—Place of memorizing—Translation into Sanskrit—Sanskrit composition, etc. (iii) Criticism of the syllabus followed in Arts Colleges at present, and suggestions for its improvement—Criticism of the comparative, scientific and historical methods as followed at the Universities—Urgency of preserving the analytico-synthetic methods of intensive study as adopted by the Shastris—Importance of preserving the Shastric traditions and Hindu culture—Opinions of distinguished Western and Eastern scholars about the Shastris and Hindu culture—A happy combination of the Western or extensive methods of study and the Eastern or intensive methods is a *desideratum*.

pp. 614-659.



Bibliography

Sanskrit Books

१ अद्वैतब्रह्मसिद्धि—काश्मीरकसदानन्दयति, २ अन्वयप्रबोध—ओङ्कारदास, ३ अभिधावृत्तिमातृका—मुकुल, ४ अर्थशास्त्र—कौटिल्य, ५ अर्थसङ्ग्रह—लौगाक्षिभास्कर, ६ अष्टाध्यायी—पाणिनि, ७ आपस्तम्बगृह्यसूत्र, ८ आश्वलायनगृह्यसूत्र, ९ उत्तररामचरित—भवभूति, १० ऋग्वेदप्रातिशाख्य, पटल१, ११ ऋग्वेदभाष्यभूमिका—सायण, १२ कविरहस्य—हलायुध, १३ काव्यचिन्ता—कालीपदतर्काचार्य, १४ काव्यप्रकाश—मम्मट, १५ काव्यमीमांसा—राजशेखर, १६ काव्यादर्श—दण्डिन्, १७ काव्यानुशासन—हेमचन्द्र, १८ काव्यालङ्कारसूत्र—वामन, १९ काशिकावृत्ति—वामनजयादित्य [न्यास—जिनेन्द्रबुद्धि], २० कुमारसम्भव-कालिदास, २१ कौमुदी (सार, लघु, मध्य)—वरदराज, २२ चरकसंहिता, २३ जातकमाला—आर्यशूर, २४ तत्त्वसङ्ग्रह—शान्तरक्षित, २५ तर्कभाषा-केशवमिश्र, २६ तर्कसङ्ग्रहदीपिका—अन्नंभट्ट, २७ दशरूपक—धनञ्जय, २८ दशोपनिषदः, २९ द्वयाश्रयकाव्य—हेमचन्द्र, ३० धर्माकूत—त्र्यम्बकरायमखिन्, ३१ ध्वन्यालोक—अभिनवगुप्तकृतलोचनसह, ३२ धातुकाव्य—नारायण, ३३ नाट्यशास्त्र—भरत (अभिनवभारतीसह), ३४ निरुक्त—यास्क (दुर्गाचार्यकृतटीकासह), ३५ न्यायकोश (झळकीकर—अभ्यंकर), ३६ न्यायसिद्धान्तमञ्जरी—जानकीनाथभट्टाचार्य, ३७ न्यायसिद्धान्तमुक्तावलि—विश्वनाथन्यायपञ्चानन, ३८ न्यायसूत्र—गौतम, ३९ पञ्चदशी—विद्यारण्य, ४० परमलघुमञ्जूषा—नागेश, ४१ परिभाषेन्दुशेखर (वाडेगांवकरकृत अनुवाद), ४२ पाणिनीयशिक्षा, ४३ पातञ्जलयोगसूत्र, ४४ प्रस्थानभेद—मधुसूदनसरस्वती, ४५ ब्रह्मसूत्रशाङ्करभाष्य, ४६ भट्टिकाव्य—जयमङ्गलाटीकासह, ४७ भाषापरिच्छेद, ४८ माण्डूक्यकारिका—गौडपादशाङ्करभाष्य, ४९ मानसोल्लासवार्तिक—सुरेश्वराचार्य, ५० मालविकाग्निमित्र—कालिदास, ५१ मीमांसान्यायप्रकाश—आपदेव (अभ्यंकरकृतटीका), ५२ मीमांसापरिभाषा—कृष्णयज्वा, ५३ रघुवंश-

विमर्श–आर. कृष्णमाचारियर, ५४ रसगङ्गाधर, ५५ वाक्यपदीय, काण्ड १–२–भर्तृहरि, ५६ वाररुचसङ्ग्रह (त्रिवेन्द्रम्), ५७ वासुदेव-विजय–वासुदेव, ५८ विद्युल्लता (मेघसन्देशव्याख्या)–पूर्णसरस्वती, ५९ वेदाङ्गप्रकाश–दयानन्दसरस्वती, ६० वेदान्तपरिभाषा–धर्मराजाध्वरीन्द्र, ६१ वेदान्तसार–सदानन्द, ६२ वैयासिकन्यायमाला –भारतीतीर्थ, ६३ व्याकरणमहाभाष्य–पतञ्जलि, अध्याय १, ६४ शब्दव्यापारविचार–मम्मट, ६५ शृङ्गारतिलक–रुद्रभट्ट, ६६ श्रीशङ्कराचार्यविरचितप्रकरणग्रन्थसङ्ग्रह (अष्टेकर, पुणें), ६७ श्लोकयोजनिकोपाय–रघुराम, ६८ षड्दर्शनसमुच्चय–हरिभद्रसूरि, ६९ सज्जनेन्द्रप्रयोगकल्पद्रुम (चौखम्बा, काशी), ७० सत्यार्थप्रकाश–दयानन्दसरस्वती, ७१ सर्वदर्शनसङ्ग्रह–माधवाचार्य (अभ्यंकरकृत टीका), ७२ साङ्ख्यकारिका, ७३ साहित्यदर्पण–विश्वनाथ, ७४ सिद्धान्तकौमुदी–भट्टोजी दीक्षित, ७५ सिद्धान्तबिन्दु–मधुसूदनसरस्वती (अभ्यंकरकृत टीका), ७६ सुगमकौमुदी–गङ्गासहाय (वेंकटेश्वर, मुंबई), ७७ सुश्रुतसंहिता, ७८ हर्षचरित–बाण.

Printed Books of the following Schools of Sanskrit Grammar

कातन्त्र, प्रक्रियाकौमुदी, मुग्धबोध, शाकटायनव्याकरण, सारस्वत, सिद्धहेमचन्द्रशब्दानुशासन.

Sanskrit Manuscripts

१ कातन्त्रलघुवृत्ति–भावसेनत्रैविद्यविरचित, २ कुमारसम्भव–नवनीतरामकृतखण्डान्वयिटीका, ३ प्रबोधचन्द्रिका–वैजलभूपति, ४ बालबोध–नरहरि, ५ लघुवाक्यबोध, ६ वाक्यपदीय (सटीक)–गङ्गादास, ७ व्याख्यानप्रक्रिया–शशिदेव, ८ व्युत्पत्तिसार–माधवपण्डित, ९ शब्दरूपावलि (1612 & 1701 A. D.), १० सारसिद्धान्तकौमुदी–वरदराज.

English Books

1 Art of Teaching and Studying Languages–F. Gouin; 2 Bilingualism–M. West; 3 Biographia Literaria–S. T. Coleridge; 4 Classics in Education–A Report (H. M. Stationery

शुद्धिपत्रम् ।

पृष्ठम्	पङ्क्तिः	अशुद्धम्	शुद्धम्
३	९	अधस्तना	अधस्तनी
१८	८	वर्धिन्य–	वर्धिन्यः
१८	१४	आधुनिकः	आधुनिक–
२९	१३	अतोऽय	अतोऽयं
३७	९	प्रारम्भ अध्ययनार्हाणि	प्रारम्भेऽध्ययनार्हाणि
४१	१३	छात्रमनसु	छात्रमनःसु
४७	५	प्राप्स्येते	प्राप्स्यतः
४८	१९	नायकयो	नायकयोः
५२	४	पदनापि	पदेनापि
५७	१६	मित्यवधारयन्	मित्यवाधारयन्
५७	२८	सुबन्तप्रधान	सुबन्तप्रधाना
५८	२३	सरस्वति	सरस्वती
५८	२६	ग्रन्था	ग्रन्थाः
५९	१३	सविशेप	सविशेषं
६५	२०	समीक्षां	समीक्षा
६५	२१	कारिका ।	कारिका
७०	२७	मुखेना समाश्रित	मुखेन समाश्रिता
७१	५	विविक्तवेन	विविक्तत्वेन
७४	१०	संमत	संमतं
७५	२०	वार्तिकग्रन्था–	वार्तिकग्रन्थाः
७५	२१	स्थिरीः	स्थिरी–
७६	१९	चोपजग्मौ	चोपजगाम
७८	२८	वलम्बिन्य	वलम्बिन्यः
७९	१९	वचनैसार्धं	वचनैः सार्धं
८०	१३	सहितायां कौटिलीर्थशास्त्रे	संहितायां कौटिलीयार्थशास्त्रे

पृष्ठम्	पङ्क्तिः	अशुद्धम्	शुद्धम्
८२	८	तथा	यथा
८५	१	तदूह्यम	तदूह्यम्
८७	२०	कस्यचिद्वङ्गीयविदुषो	श्रीविद्याशङ्करभारती–स्वामिपादानां
८८	१	प्राता इत्येव	प्राता, इत्येव
९१	२२	मार्गोपकृता	मार्गोपकृताः
९२	१२	ज्ञानाप्रधान्ये	ज्ञानप्राधान्ये
९२	१९	टिपण्यादिभ्यो	टिप्पण्यादिभ्यो

ERRATA

Page	Line	Incorrect	Correct
95	10	forms	form
96	35	Thorndyke	Thorndike
99	9	the longer is it	the longer it is
106	1	in the senior years	from the senior years
115	31	in coversation	in conversation
136	15	emotins	emotions
141	22	and the उद्दीपनविभाव	and उद्दीपनविभाव
143	24	consiouness	consciousness
159	27	assumas	assumes
166	22	यथ	यथा
176	2	for some-	for, some-
176	11	co-existance	co-existence
198	16	अर्पकष	अपकर्ष
205	20	qenerlization	generalization
219	30	of the root भू & अस्	of the roots भू & अस्
222	14	a prose sentece	a prose sentence
243	17	पूवमीमांसा	पूर्वमीमांसा
243	22	अपूव	अपूर्व
251	12	wiih the	with the

Page	Line	Incorrect	Correct
252	15	while principal thing	while the principal thing
255	20	whola मन्त्र	whole मन्त्र
258	28	अतिदशे	अतिदेश
275	1	प्रतिषघ	प्रतिषेध
276	3	प्रतिषघ	प्रतिषेध
288	23	the seven	the six
291	6	श्रति	श्रुति
306	10	सविद्	संविद्
307	24	ihe negation	the negation
308	25	Upanishands	Upanishads
310	13	इश्वर	ईश्वर
310	15	इश्वर	ईश्वर
312	21	methd ology	methodology
343	30	froms	forms
347	13	adjecttves	adjectives
413	28	यथा	उभयथा
422	8	obiect	object
443	17	आङ्काक्षा	आकाङ्क्षा
451	28	श्लष	श्लेष
475	20	गाणी लक्षणा	गौणी लक्षणा
508	13	तात्पर्याथ	तात्पर्यार्थ
541	3	by higher	by advanced
553	12	componud	compound
584	32	languge	language
607	9	rytional	rational
630	31	suceess	success
650	32	aer	are
653	12	A	As

[Misprints easily recognizable are left out.]

संस्कृतानुशीलनविवेकः ।

[The Problem of Sanskrit Teaching]

संस्कृताध्यापन-प्रश्नावलिः ।

अयि गीर्वाणवागनुरागिणो महाभागाः ! नैतदविदितं भवतां यद्‌खिलेऽप्यस्मिन्भारतवर्षे आङ्ग्लपाठशालास्वध्येतृभिर्बालैरधीयमानेषु विविधविषयेषु 'संस्कृतम्' इत्यन्यतमो विषयः। आङ्ग्लपाठशालासु प्रायश्चतुर्थश्रेणीतः संस्कृताध्यापनमारभ्यते। प्रतिसप्ताहं चत्वारिंशन्निमेषपरिमिताश्चत्वारः पञ्च वा कालांशा (periods) लभ्यन्ते संस्कृताध्यापनाय। एतेभ्योऽनध्यायदिनानि व्यवकलनीयानि। एवं संस्कृतभाषाधिगमाय न पर्याप्तः कालो लभ्यते छात्रैः। अपि चेदानीं न केवलं विप्राः किन्त्वविप्रा अपि संस्कृतमध्येतुमीहन्ते। गीर्वाणभाषा च सर्वेषामपि भारतीयानामनर्घ्यविज्ञानरत्नानामाकरः, आचारधर्माणामधिष्ठानं, नानाशास्त्रविद्याकलाकलापानां महोदधिः। एतस्या गीर्वाणवाङ्मयनिलीनायाः सुविचाराचाररूपायाः संस्कृतेः परित्राणसमुन्नत्यर्थं गीर्वाणभाषाज्ञानं तदधिजिगांसुभ्योऽशेषच्छात्रेभ्यो वितरणीयमित्यपरिहार्यं सञ्जातम्। तस्मात्सुकुमारमतीनां सकलजातीयकुमाराणां गीर्वाणवाण्यां सुगमप्रचाराय सर्वैरपि प्रज्ञावद्भिर्निरतिशयप्रेमास्पदीभूतायाः सुरभारत्या अध्यापने कापि रुचिरोपयुक्ता पद्धतिराविष्करणीया समाश्रयणीया चेत्यत्र न कोऽपि सन्देहः। ये संस्कृताध्ययनमात्रेण शास्त्रेष्वसाधारणनैपुण्यमधिजिगामिषन्ति, न तेषां कृतेऽयं विमर्शः। ये तु गीर्वाणभारत्यामन्तर्हितं महाकाव्यनाटककथादिप्रबन्धानां सौन्दर्यं मूलास्वादनेनावगन्तुमिच्छन्ति, तेषां सामान्यच्छात्राणां कृतेऽयं प्रस्तावः। अधुना देववाचः सार्वत्रिकप्रचारार्थं विशिष्टशास्त्राधीतेरपेक्षया काव्यनाटकादिवाङ्मयस्य तद्गतभाषासरण्याश्चाध्ययनमेव हिततरं भवेदिति सुनिर्णीतम्। 'एण्डागीतानि

काव्यानि' इति वदतां पण्डितप्रकाण्डानां कालस्तु समाप्तकल्पः, यतो विशिष्टशास्त्रनैपुण्यं समासादयन्तो जना यत्र कुत्रापि कतिचित्का एव।

अधुनातने काले वैभवस्य परां कोटिमधिरूढायामपि सपत्नीस्थानीयाङ्ग्लभाषाया, सुरसरस्वतीसेवासंसक्ताः केचन विद्वद्वरेण्याः प्रवक्तृत्व-ग्रन्थप्रकाशनादिभिर्विविधोपायैः सुरभारत्याः सार्वत्रिकप्रचारार्थं भारतीय-संस्कृतिरक्षार्थं च प्रयतमानाः संलक्ष्यन्ते। किन्तु गीर्वाणभारत्याः सार्वत्रिक-प्रचारः सम्यगध्ययनाध्यापनाधीन इत्यपि न परोक्षं प्रेक्षावताम्। अक्लेश-पुरस्सरं रसोत्पादकमध्यापनमेवाध्ययनसौकर्याय गुणनिकया ज्ञानविवृद्धये च भवतीति विद्यते हेतुहेतुमद्भावोऽध्ययनाध्यापनयोः। सम्प्रति भारतवर्षे बालानां संस्कृताध्यापनार्थं संस्कृतपाठशालासु मातृभाषोपयोगपूर्वकमुत्तरोत्तरं संस्कृतभाषाव्यवहारं प्रोत्साहयन्ती प्राचीनपण्डितपद्धतिरनुस्रियमाणा वर्तते, आङ्ग्लपाठशालासु चाङ्ग्लभाषाव्यवहारप्रमुखा व्याकरणाङ्ग्लानुवादप्रधाना भाण्डारकरपद्धतिरित्येतत्पद्धतिद्वयं प्रायेण प्रचारबहुलं परिदृश्यते। आदितः संस्कृतभाषाव्यवहारसौकर्यसम्पादयित्री तृतीया संवादपद्धतिस्तु पर्याप्तप्रयोगा-भावान्निपुणाध्यापकविरहाच्च विरलत्वेनैवोपयुज्यते। आङ्ग्लपाठशालासु तु संस्कृताध्ययनस्य प्रायो दोषसङ्कुलत्वादरुचिकरत्वाच्च तत्रत्याश्छात्राः संस्कृता-ध्ययनं विहायान्यभाषाभ्यासमवलम्बन्ते। अतश्चाङ्ग्लविद्यालयेषु संस्कृतभाषा प्रतिदिनमसितपक्षेन्दुकलेव क्षीणत्वमुपयातेत्यहो दौर्भाग्यं सुरभारत्याः! प्रचलितबहुविधपद्धतिपरीक्षणपूर्वकं पूर्वतनानां गुणानङ्गीकृत्यैव नूतनसरण्य-नुसरणं श्रेय इति निपुणं विचार्य, संस्कृताध्ययनाध्यापनदुरवस्थाया दूरी-करणाय भारतवर्षीयविविधविदुषां समुचिताध्यापनपद्धतिविषयेऽभिमतान्य-भिज्ञातुमना मया नानाप्रयोगसमीक्षामूलिका 'संस्कृताध्यापनप्रश्नावलिः' वर्षषट्कात्प्रागुपनिबद्धा, या भिन्नप्रान्तस्थानां विदुषां शतकपञ्चकस्य सविधे प्रत्युत्तरप्राप्तये सप्रश्रयाभ्यर्थनापुरस्सरं प्रेषिता, संस्कृतपत्रिकासु च प्रका-शिताऽऽसीत्। तदानीं गीर्वाणवाग्वद्धादराणां विदुषां त्रयोदशभिः संस्कृत-भाषया, अष्टभिर्महाराष्ट्रभाषया, त्रिभिश्चाङ्ग्लभाषयेति केवलं चतुर्विंश-तिसङ्ख्याकैर्हस्तलेखरूपेण सानुग्रहमुत्तराणि प्रेषितानि मत्सविधे। संस्कृतो-त्तराणि प्रेषयतां विदुषामेकः संयुक्तप्रान्तीयः, एको गुर्जरदेशीयः, द्वौ मद्र-विभागस्थौ, नव च महाराष्ट्रियाः सन्ति। उपरितनविदुषां प्रतिप्रश्नं

विविधोत्तराणि संस्कृताध्यापनपद्धतिजिज्ञासूनां सम्यग्बोधाय समुत्कृष्टपद्धतिगवेषणायै च मत्प्रश्नैः साकं 'बेळगाव'नगरस्थायां 'मधुरवाण्यां' अयोध्यास्थ-साप्ताहिक-'संस्कृते' च प्रकाशितपूर्वाण्येव । सत्यवसरे सकलान्यपि प्रत्युत्तराणि ग्रन्थरूपेण पृथक्तया प्रकाश्येरन्नेव ।

संस्कृतभाषाजिज्ञासूनामाङ्ग्लविद्यालयच्छात्राणामध्यापने ये विवाद्याः प्रश्नाः समुद्भवन्ति तानुद्दिश्य मुद्रितपूर्वैवेयं 'संस्कृताध्यापनप्रश्नावलिः' संस्कृतानुरागिणां समीक्षायै सम्यङ्निर्णयाय चात्र पुनरपि प्रकाश्यते । अन्यच्चेयं प्रश्नावलिरत्रत्यप्रबन्धोपन्यासरूपैव, यतस्तदन्तर्गतानां केषाञ्चित्प्रश्नानां प्रत्युत्तराण्यपि लभ्येरन्नत्रोपस्थापितेषु प्रबन्धेषु। अधस्तना प्रश्नावलिरन्यानपि विदुषः प्रत्युत्तरलेखनाय प्रेरयेत्, संस्कृतानुशीलनविषये युक्तायुक्तनिर्णायको विविधप्रबन्धगतो मदीयविमर्शश्च सरससरलाध्यापनरीतिगवेषणायोपयुक्ततरो विबुधजनसम्मतश्च भवेदिति बलवदाशास्यते ।

सामान्यप्रश्नाः ।

१ (अ) बालानां कृते या संस्कृताध्यापनपद्धतिः पुरातनकालादारभ्याद्य यावद् गीर्वाणभाषापण्डितैः समाश्रिता समाश्रीयते च, तस्याः स्वरूपं कीदृक्, किं च तद्गतविषयाणामानुपूर्व्यम् ? ।

(आ) उदीच्यभारतीयानां दाक्षिणात्यानां च पद्धत्योः के भेदसाम्ये ? ।

(इ) गीर्वाणभाषापण्डितानामध्यापनप्रणाल्या के गुणा दोषा वा ? सा प्रणाल्याङ्ग्लपाठशालास्वनुस्रियमाणा चेत् किं परिवर्तनमिष्यते ? ।

२ त्रिदिवं गतानां डॉ. भाण्डारकरमहोदयानां संस्कृताध्यापनपरिपाटी बालानां सुखबोधाय कियन्मात्रं गुणावहा ? ।

३ इदानीं पाश्चात्यदेशेषु कैश्चिदध्यापकैः संस्कृततुल्यानां 'ग्रीक्-लॅटिन्' इत्येतासां प्रविरलप्रचारभाषाणामध्यापने तां तामेव भाषामाश्रित्य संवादपद्धतिः प्रयुज्यते । यस्याः कस्या अपि भाषाया अध्ययनाध्यापनविषये तदधिष्ठानभूतानि कानिचिद् व्यापकतत्त्वानि समवलम्ब्यमानानि वर्तन्त इति सन्दृश्य तैस्तानि बालमनोविज्ञानानुसारेण (Child psychology) समुद्भावितानि सङ्कलीकृतानि च । तेषां तत्त्वानां तस्याः संवादपद्धत्याश्च (Conversational method) संस्कृताध्यापने कियानंशो ग्राह्यः ? ।

४ आङ्ग्लतृतीयश्रेणीतः संस्कृताध्ययनारम्भे क्रियमाणे कः प्रत्यवायः ? तथा कृते चोपक्रमाध्यापनं कया रीत्या कार्यम् ?।

व्याकरणम् ।

५ (अ) किं भाषामुखेन व्याकरणं पाठनीयमुत व्याकरणमुखेन भाषा ? कस्मात् कारणाच्च ?।

(आ) सामान्यच्छात्राणां संस्कृतवाङ्मयप्रवेशाय कियन्मात्रं व्याकरणज्ञानमपेक्ष्यते, के व्याकरणविभागाश्चात्यावश्यकाः ?।

(इ) सौकर्योपयोगदृष्ट्या व्याकरणविभागानामध्यापने कोऽनुक्रमः समीचीनः स्यात् ?।

(ई) शब्दरूपावलिसमासचक्रयोः प्रस्तावः कदा कार्यः ?।

(उ) अध्यापकेन सुकोमलमतिभिश्छात्रैः किं व्याकरणनियमानुरोधेन रूपसिद्धिः कारयितव्या, तैः पुस्तकस्थानि सिद्धरूपाण्येव कण्ठे करणीयानि वा ?।

(ऊ) संस्कृताध्ययनाय मातृभाषाव्याकरणज्ञानस्य कियत्यपेक्षा ?।

अनुवादः ।

६ (अ) अपि 'मातृभाषयानुवाद' इति संस्कृतभाषाध्यापनस्यैकमेव साधनम् ? अन्यान्यपि साधनानि स्युश्चेत्कानि तानि ?।

(आ) संस्कृतस्य मातृभाषयानुवादः केषु केषु स्थलेषु हितमावहेत् ?।

(इ) मातृभाषानुवादस्य का पद्धतिः श्रेयसी, संस्कृतशब्दानुसारिणी मातृभाषासरण्यनुसारिणी वा ? उभयोरप्युपयोगो यथासम्भवं कुत्र कथं चेष्टः ?।

(ई) मातृभाषाया आङ्ग्लभाषाया वा संस्कृतेऽनुवादः सामान्यच्छात्राणां कियत्परिमाणेनोपकारकः ? उपकारकः स्याच्चेत्स आङ्ग्लविद्यालयेषु कतमस्यां श्रेण्यामारब्धव्यः कया रीत्या चाध्यापयितव्यः ?।

वाङ्मयाभ्यासः ।

७ (अ) उपक्रमावस्थायां किंस्वरूपं वाङ्मयं छात्रैरभ्यसनीयम्, किं विश्लिष्टवाक्यानि (Disconnected sentences) उत कथासंवादवर्णनात्मकाः संश्लिष्टपरिच्छेदाः (Connected passages) ? किमर्थं च ?।

(आ) संस्कृतवाङ्मयं केन भाषासाधनेन (Medium) अध्यापयितव्यम्, संस्कृतभाषया मातृभाषया वा ?

(इ) वाङ्मयाध्यापनेऽध्यापकेन (१) प्रश्नप्रणाली (Questioning), (२) अनुवादप्रणाली (Translation), (३) कथनप्रणाली (Telling) चेत्येताः कुत्र कथं वा प्रयोज्याः ? प्रश्नकथनार्थविवरणानि कतरया भाषया कार्याणि, मातृभाषया संस्कृतभाषया वा ? किमर्थं च ? उभयभाषोपयोगः कर्तव्यश्चेत्कुत्र संस्कृतं प्रयोज्यं कुत्र च मातृभाषा ?।

(ई) कथाकाव्यसंवादवर्णनादीनामध्यापनं प्रत्येकं कया विभिन्नपरिपाट्या कार्यम् ?।

(उ) वाङ्मयाध्यापने प्रायः कः कल्पोऽनुसर्तव्योऽध्यापकेन, कया दृष्टया च ?।

(ऊ) गीर्वाणवाङ्मयगताः पर्यायशब्दाः (Synonyms), भिन्नार्थशब्दाः (Homonyms), वाक्सम्प्रदायाश्च (Idioms) कया पद्धत्याध्येतव्याः ? अमरकोशप्रस्तावः कदा कथं च कार्यः ?।

पाठ्यपुस्तकानि।

८ (अ) बालानां सुखबोधाय समीचीनानि संस्कृतपाठ्यपुस्तकानि कृच्छ्रेणैव लभ्यन्ते। नूतनेषु विरचयितव्येषु कानि तत्त्वानि लेखकैरात्मनः पुरः संस्थाप्यानि ? पुस्तकगतपाठानां क्रमविषये स्थूलतया किं तत्त्वमाश्रयणीयम् ?।

(आ) बालानां पाठ्यपुस्तकेषु कीदृशी भाषा के च विषया उपयोक्तव्याः ? अभिजातभाषायाः (Classical language) प्रस्तावस्तेषु कियन्मात्रं शक्यः ? अभिजातग्रन्थानामभ्यासः कतमस्यां श्रेण्यां कतमे वयसि वा साध्यः ?।

(इ) संस्कृतवाङ्मयस्थाः कथाकाव्यनाटकादयो विविधप्रकारा बालानां पाठ्यपुस्तकेषु श्रेण्यनुरोधेन यथाक्रमं कथं संनिवेश्याः ?।

(ई) पाठ्यपुस्तकेषु व्याकरणविभागाः कथं संविभाज्याः कया रीत्या च लेखनीयाः ?।

(उ) आङ्ग्लभाषायां सूक्ष्माभ्यासार्हेभ्यः पाठ्यपुस्तकेभ्योऽतिरिक्तानि बालोचितानि बहूनि स्थूलवाचनपुस्तकानि (Books for Rapid Reading) लभ्यन्ते। तादृशेषु संस्कृतभाषायां लेखितव्येषु कानि तत्त्वानि लेखकैरनुसर्तव्यानि?

सङ्कीर्णप्रश्नाः ।

९ 'अल्पारम्भः क्षेमकरः' इति न्यायात् कथावर्णनपत्रादिपरिच्छेदरूपेण प्रबन्धलेखनं छात्राणां कियद्धिताय भवेत् ? अयं विषय आङ्ग्लविद्यालयशिक्षाप्रणाल्यां कथं संनिवेश्यः कया रीत्या चाध्याप्यः ? ।

१० वाङ्मयव्याकरणयोः के भागाः कण्ठस्थाः करणीया अकरणीया वा ? पाणिनीयसूत्राणामध्ययनं यथाप्रसङ्गमाङ्ग्लपाठशालासु कियन्मात्रं साध्यम् ? ।

११ आङ्ग्लविद्यालयेषु संस्कृतभाषायाः पाठ्यक्रमनिर्धारणे (Curriculum construction) का दृष्टिः समवलम्बनीया ? केषु विभागेषु च पाठ्यक्रमपरिवर्तनमिष्टम् ? ।

१२ लौकिककार्येषु संस्कृतज्ञानां संस्कृतवाग्व्यवहारः सुसाध्यो दुःसाध्यो वा ? दुःसाध्यश्चेत्केन कारणेन ? सुसाध्यश्चेत् कैरुपायैः ? ।

१३ आङ्ग्लमहाविद्यालयेषु प्रधानत्वेन संस्कृतमधीत्यापि विश्वविद्यालयोपाधिधारिणोऽध्यापका अध्यापनेऽन्यत्र वा संस्कृतभाषया सौकर्येण संभाषणादिव्यवहारं कर्तुं न पारयन्ति । तेषामध्यापने संस्कृतभाषाव्यवहार इष्टोऽनिष्टो वा ?। इष्टश्चेदध्यापकैर्भाषाव्यवहारनैपुण्यं कथं सम्पाद्यम् ? ।

१४ संस्कृतशिक्षकाणां संस्कृतवाग्व्यवहारक्षमत्वाय महाविद्यालयीने संस्कृतपाठ्यक्रमे किं परिवर्तनमिष्यते ? ।

संस्कृताध्ययनदुरवस्था तद्दूरीकरणोपायाश्च ।

कतिपयवत्सरेभ्यः प्राग्भारतवर्षस्य नानादिग्भागेषु प्राचुर्येण समुपालभ्यन्त गीर्वाणभाषाप्रवीणाः पण्डितप्रकाण्डा ये सुबोधमधुरया गीर्वाणवाण्या संलपन्तः श्रोत्रसुखमुत्पादयन्ति स्म । नानाशास्त्रपारावारीणानां तेषां तेषां पूर्वतनपण्डितप्रवराणां गीर्वाणवाग्विलासं स्मारं स्मारमद्यापि सुखदो-

लामध्यारोहति चेतः । प्राक्कालीना परिपाटी त्वियं यद्दाक्षिणात्याः पण्डिता उदीच्यभारतं गत्वा तत्रात्मनोऽगाधपाण्डित्येन प्रथितयशसः सञ्जाताः । स्वकीयसुरसरस्वतीनैपुण्येन प्रगाढशास्त्रावगाहनेन च वाराणसीमद्याप्यलङ्कुर्वाणाः सन्ति दाक्षिणात्याः पण्डितप्रवरा इति महद्गौरवास्पदम् । दक्षिणभारते त्वधुना का दुर्गतिर्दृष्टिसरणिमायाति ? अत्र न केवलं हीनत्वमापन्नाऽस्मदीया निसर्गमधुरा देवभारती, अपि तु केचनाधुनिकपण्डितम्मन्याः प्रलपन्ति यद् " इयं देववाक् पञ्चत्वं गता । आधुनिकभाषाविचाराणामपेक्षया सा न्यूनतमा, निकृष्टतमा च । किं प्रयोजनमस्मदीयमेतादृश्या मृतभाषया ? " इति । एतत्प्रलपितश्रवणेन दूयेत कस्यापि गीर्वाणवागनुरागिणश्चेतः । सौभाग्यस्यायं विषयो यदेतस्मिन्नप्यननुकूले काले कैश्चिदङ्गुलिमेयैः पण्डितैरद्यावधि दक्षिणभारते गीर्वाणभाषागतविविधशास्त्राणां पठनपाठनयोः परम्पराऽनाडम्बरपूर्वकमविच्छिन्नत्वेन प्रचालिता । किन्तु सुरसरस्वतीशेवधिरूपास्ते ते प्राचीनपण्डिताः प्रायः प्रतिदिनं कालवशत्वमुपयान्ति, ये च विरलत्वेनोपलभ्यमानास्ते वयसश्चरम भागं प्राप्ता इति हेतोः संस्कृताध्ययनपरम्परा छिन्नप्राया संवृत्तेत्यहो दौर्भाग्यं विबुधवाण्याः । एतत्कारणश्रेणिवशादेवेयं सुरभारती मुमूर्षुत्वमापन्ना, एषा च तस्या दुरवस्था " अहो कष्टं सापि प्रतिदिनमधोऽधः प्रविशति " इति भर्तृहरिवचनं स्मारयति । अद्यत्व आङ्ग्लभाषाध्ययनस्यापरिहार्यापेक्षा वर्तत इति विवादातीतमेव । किन्तु संस्कृतभारत्याः समुचिताध्ययनेनापि लब्धावकाशेन भाव्यं, यतो भारतीयसंस्कृतेः परित्राणं संस्कृतभाषासमुद्धाराधिष्ठितमेव ।

उदीच्यभारते संस्कृताध्ययनविषये यावान्समादरो दृश्यते न तावान्मोहमयीविभागे । उदीच्यभारते प्रतिमण्डलं संस्कृतपरीक्षासमितिभिः प्राच्यशास्त्रप्रावीण्यलब्धये विविधपरीक्षा विहिताः सन्ति । निर्धनत्वादाङ्ग्लभाषामध्येतुमक्षमाः पादोनलक्षसङ्ख्याकाश्छात्राः प्रतिवर्षमेताः परीक्षाः समुत्तरन्ति । किन्त्वेतादृशे संस्कृताध्ययने छात्राणां न समधिकं प्रलोभनं दृश्येत, यावत्परीक्षोत्तीर्णानां राजशासनद्वारा जीविकोपाया नोपकल्पिताः स्युः । आङ्ग्लोपपदधारिभिर्यावती वृत्तिर्लभ्यते तावत्यपि संस्कृतपण्डितैर्नाधिगम्यत इति महद्विषादस्थानम् । उदीच्यभारते गीर्वाणभाषाभिवृद्ध्यर्थमन्येऽपि विविधोपायाश्चिन्त्यन्ते । तत्र संस्कृतभाषामात्रव्यवहारशरणैः पण्डितप्रवरैः

सुरसरस्वतीसंवर्धनोपायभूतानि संमेलनानि विधीयन्ते विविधा नियतकालिक-पत्रिकाश्च प्रकाश्यन्ते। केचिदमन्दोत्साहाः पण्डिता गीर्वाणभाषाया राष्ट्र-भाषात्वमापादयितुमपि प्रयतन्ते, येषां समुद्यमं क्षाराम्बुधेर्मधुबिन्दुनिपातनेन माधुर्यापादनमिवासुकरं मन्यमानाः केचिदन्येऽपि सन्ति।

मोहमयीविभागे न त्वेतादृशी स्थितिः। अत्र संस्कृतपाठशालानां संस्कृतपरीक्षाणां च वैरल्यादाङ्ग्लपाठशालामहाविद्यालयेषु गैर्वाण्या यज्ज्ञा-नमधिगम्यते तत्तु गाधोदककल्पं, यतः संस्कृतविषयः प्राय आङ्ग्लमहा-विद्यालयेष्वाङ्ग्लभाषाद्वारैवाधीयतेऽध्याप्यते च। संस्कृतमधिकृत्य विश्व-विद्यालयपरीक्षास्वाङ्ग्लभाषायां प्रश्नाः पृच्छ्यन्ते, तेषां प्रत्युत्तराणि चाङ्ग्ल-भाषयैव प्रायो लिख्यन्ते छात्रैः। संस्कृतानुवादार्थं परीक्षासु दीयमान आङ्ग्लभाषापरिच्छेदो विरलैरेवानूद्यते संस्कृते। विश्वविद्यालयपरीक्षासु संस्कृतप्रबन्धलेखनविषयकाणां प्रश्नानामत्यन्ताभाव एव। संस्कृतनैपुण्यदर्शकं विश्वविद्यालयोपाधिं लभमानानां छात्राणां स्तोकांशेनापि पाणिनीयपरिभाषा-परिचयो न भवति। कैश्चिच्छात्रैः पाठ्यत्वेन निर्दिष्टाः संस्कृतमूलग्रन्था अपि नाभ्यस्यन्ते, किमुत तत्सम्बन्धिनः संस्कृतटीकाग्रन्थाः। संस्कृतमूल-ग्रन्थाध्ययनं विनाऽऽङ्ग्लभाषानिष्ठानां ग्रन्थानुवादटिप्पण्यादीनां वाचन-मात्रेण ते सम्यक्तयोत्तीर्णा भवन्ति। येषां चाङ्ग्लभाषायां प्रावीण्यं स्यात्त एव संस्कृतपरीक्षासु समधिकगुणाँल्लब्धुमीशते। संस्कृतवर्णोच्चारानजानाना एतादृशाश्छात्राः संस्कृतगद्यपद्यपरिच्छेदान् समीचीनतया प्रोच्चैर्वाचयितुं न प्रभवन्ति, यतस्तेषां सुविशदवर्णोच्चारपूर्वको वाचनाभ्यास आङ्ग्लपाठ-शालामहाविद्यालयेषु कदाचिदेव भवति। एतादृश्या पद्धत्या संस्कृतनै-पुण्योपाधिं लभमाना जना यदाऽऽङ्ग्लपाठशालासु गीर्वाणभाषाशिक्षकपदे नियुज्यन्ते तदा तेषामध्यापने कियती रतिः को वा गुणः स्यात्? सम्य-ग्ज्ञानापेक्षयाऽन्धपरम्परान्यायेन यया कयाप्यध्यापनरीत्या छात्राणां परीक्षा-समुत्तरणमेवादिमं प्रयोजनमेतेषां शिक्षकाणाम्।

प्रत्याङ्ग्लविद्यालयं संस्कृताध्यापकपदे प्राचीनपण्डितो नियोक्तव्य इत्यासीत्पूर्वं राजशासनम्। मातृभाषया गीर्वाणभाषया वाऽध्यापयितुं क्षमा अप्येते शास्त्रिप्रवरा आङ्ग्लभाषाज्ञानाभावात्तद्भाषागतं भाण्डारकरमहो-

दयविरचितसंस्कृतपाठ्यपुस्तकद्वयं पाठयितुमक्षमाः। छात्रैः परीक्षाप्रश्नोत्तराणि त्वाङ्ग्लभाषाया लेखितव्यानीति नियमसद्भावात्प्राचीनपण्डिताननुपयुक्ता-न्मन्वाना आङ्ग्लोपपदधारिणः शिक्षकाः शास्त्रिणां विषयेऽनादरभावमभज-न्त। आङ्ग्लभाषागतसंस्कृतपाठ्यपुस्तकद्वयमध्यापयितुमीषदाङ्ग्लभाषाध्ययनं शास्त्रिणामवश्यकरणीयत्वेनापतितमित्यासीद् व्युत्क्रमः संस्कृताध्यापनविषये। संस्कृताध्यापने शास्त्रिप्रवराणामपेक्षयाऽऽङ्ग्लोपपदधारिणोऽध्यापकानुपयुक्त-तरानीक्षमाणैर्भाण्डारकरमहोदयैः प्रथमपाठ्यपुस्तकस्थे प्रस्तावे लिखितं यत् " Sanskrit would be considerably more easy than it is, if there were men educated in our English Colleges to teach it. "—अत्र वयमेतद्वक्तुकामा यद्भाण्डारकरमहोदयदृशा सन्तु नाम केऽपि दोषाः शास्त्रिणामध्यापने। किन्तु तेषां गीर्वाणभाषाज्ञानेन साकमाङ्ग्लोप-पदधारिणां संस्कृतज्ञानं न मात्रयापि तुलामर्हति। उपरितनमतमनुसृत्यैव सम्प्रति शास्त्रिण आङ्ग्लविद्यालयेषु क्वाचित्कत्वेनाध्यापकपदे नियुज्यन्ते, ये च नियुक्तपूर्वास्तेऽप्यचिरादेव विश्रान्तिवृत्तिभाजो भविष्यन्ति। अधुना तु मातृभाषायामनूदितयोरपि भाण्डारकरकृतपुस्तकयोराङ्ग्लोपपदधारिणाम-ध्यापकानां च संस्कृतानुरागोत्पादने चिरानुभवसिद्धमकिञ्चित्करत्वमेव प्रत्यक्षीक्रियते।

वाराणसीविहारकलिकातालवपुरमद्रादिविभागेषु यथा प्राच्यशास्त्र-नैपुण्यसम्पादनार्थं विश्वविद्यालयद्वारा राजशासनद्वारा च विविधपरीक्षाः परिकल्पिताः संस्कृतमहाविद्यालया वा प्रतिष्ठापितास्तथा मोहमयीविभागे तदर्थं न केऽप्युपायाश्चिन्तिताः। चिन्तिताः स्युश्चेत्ते दरिद्राणां मनोरथा इव विफलतां गताः। कियदिदमौदासीन्यं मन्दादरो वा मोहमयीविभागस्थानां गीर्वाणवाणीविषये। महदेतत्सौभाग्यं यत्पुण्यपत्तने 'वेदशास्त्रोत्तेजकसभा' 'वेणुग्रामे' च मधुरवाणीपत्रिकासञ्चालनमित्येते गीर्वाणभाषासमुत्कर्षोपायभूताः केचित्समुद्यमाः प्रचलिताः सन्ति। किन्तु समुचिताश्रयं विना ते कथं सुफलतामावहेयुः?। गीर्वाणभाषा प्राच्यविद्या वा निमित्तीकृत्याङ्ग्लभाषा-मुखेनैव प्रस्तुताः प्रयत्नास्तु कियन्मात्रं गीर्वाणभाषोपकारका इत्ययं विषयो विज्ञैरेव निर्णेयः।

एतस्यां दुरवस्थायां संस्कृतभाषासमुद्धारमन्तरेण नयनपदवीमापतन्तः केऽप्युपाया अत्रोपन्यस्यन्ते। आङ्ग्लविद्यालयेषु संस्कृताध्ययनस्य द्विविधेन पाठ्यक्रमेण भाव्यम्। एकः सामान्यच्छात्राणां कृतेऽन्यश्च समधिकनैपुण्यलिप्सूनां कृते। रामायणमहाभारतादिसदृशपद्यरचनाया हितोपदेशपञ्चतन्त्रादिसदृशगद्यरचनायाश्च परिमितव्याकरणोपकृतमर्थनिर्धारणक्षमत्वमेवास्तु प्रमुखप्रयोजनमाङ्ग्लकलाशालागते संस्कृताध्यापने। अयं पाठ्यक्रमः सामान्यानां बुद्धिमतां च च्छात्राणां समान एव भवतु प्रवेशपरीक्षापर्यन्तम्। अनन्तरं महाविद्यालयेषु प्रथमवर्षादारभ्यैव सामान्यानां मतिमतां च च्छात्राणां भिन्नौ पाठ्यक्रमौ प्रशस्येते। सामान्यच्छात्राणां कृते लघुकौमुदीपठनसनाथं साहित्यशास्त्रपरिचयसमेतं च महाकाव्यनाटकादीनां सम्यगर्थावगममात्रं भवतु संस्कृताध्ययनप्रयोजनम्। सविशेषप्रावीण्यलिप्सुभिर्मतिमद्भिश्छात्रैर्विशिष्टशास्त्राणां प्रगाढाध्ययनं समाश्रयणीयम्। महाविद्यालयेषु लघुकौमुद्या मध्यकौमुद्या वा पठनपाठनयोर्नान्तरीयकत्वं संस्कृताध्ययनेऽत्र परिगण्यते। विश्वविद्यालयपरीक्षापत्रिकासु केचित्प्रश्नाः संस्कृतभाषया प्रष्टव्यास्तेषां प्रत्युत्तराण्यपि संस्कृतभाषयैव च्छात्रैर्लेखनीयानीति विधिर्विधेयः। संस्कृतानुवादेन सार्धं संस्कृतानुवादस्थाने वा वाक्यवृद्धिसङ्क्षेपविधानरूपाः पाठ्यग्रन्थसारकथनस्वरूपाः कथावर्णनपत्रादिप्रबन्धलेखनात्मका विशिष्टवाक्प्रयोगाकाङ्क्षां सूचयन्तश्चापेक्षितसंस्कृतोत्तरा विविधाः संस्कृतप्रश्नाः परीक्षापत्रिकायां सन्निवेश्याः। एतादृशाः प्रश्नाः संस्कृतानुवादप्रश्नापेक्षया सुगमतराः संस्कृतज्ञानोपचयकराश्च सन्ति। सामान्यच्छात्राणां तु संस्कृतभाषयाऽनुवादप्रबन्धादिलेखनं नेष्यते। तैः परीक्षोत्तरेषु प्रायः पाठ्यग्रन्थभागानां मातृभाषयाऽनुवादः कार्यः। उपरिदर्शितविविधप्रश्नानां तु केचित्सुगमप्रकाराः सामान्यच्छात्राणां कृतेऽप्युपयुक्ताः स्युः। आङ्ग्लभाषापेक्षया संस्कृताध्यापने संस्कृतभाषा मातृभाषा वा यथाप्रसङ्गं प्रयुक्ता सती महद्धितमावहेत्। प्रावीण्यपरीक्षासु न केवलं मातृभाषयाऽऽङ्ग्लभाषया वा मूलसंस्कृतस्यानुवादोऽपेक्षणीयः, किन्तु मूलगद्यपद्यविभागस्य संस्कृतटीकानुसारि संस्कृतव्याख्यानमपि च्छात्रेभ्योऽपेक्षणीयं, येन ते छात्रा मूलग्रन्थेन साकं टीकाग्रन्थानप्यध्येष्यन्ते। एतेन नूतनपाठ्यक्रमानुसरणेन संस्कृतभाषायां

समधिकनैपुण्यमधिगच्छद्भिरेव विश्वविद्यालयोपाधिधारिभिः संस्कृतशिक्षकपदमन्वर्थतया मण्डितं स्यादित्यत्र नास्ति शङ्काकणिकाऽपि ।

संस्कृतभाषासमुन्नतेर्न कापि प्रत्याशा यावदेतादृशा गुणवन्तः शिक्षका न लभ्यन्ते । किन्तु यावद्विश्वविद्यालयस्थविद्वांस उपरिवर्णितं पाठ्यक्रमपरिवर्तनं विधातुं नेहन्ते तावदध्यापननैपुण्यमधिजिगमिषुभिर्गीर्वाणभाषाशिक्षकैः किं विधेयमित्यत्र विषये लघुविमर्शः क्रियते ।

आदौ गीर्वाणभाषायाः प्राथमिकाध्यापनार्थं प्रयोगनिपुणा अमन्दोत्साहाश्चाध्यापका अपेक्ष्यन्ते, यत एतादृशा एवाध्यापकाः सततं बालच्छात्रहिताय प्रयतन्ते । उत्साहशीलानामेवाध्यापकानामुत्साहच्छटा तेषु सङ्क्रम्य तेषां मनस्यध्ययनं प्रति ऋजुभावं समुत्पादयति । पुनश्चाध्यापको रसज्ञः स्याच्चेत्तस्य साहित्यमात्रेणोत्कृष्टग्रन्थानामन्तेवासिनां साहित्यरसाभिरुचिः सुष्ठु समाहिता भवति । एतदर्थं काव्यविवृतिकाले रसभावालङ्कारविवरणं यथासमयं सविस्तरतया विधातुं प्रत्येकमध्यापकेन प्रयतितव्यम् । अध्यापनविषयेऽध्यापकैः

"शिष्टा क्रिया कस्यचिदात्मसंस्था संक्रान्तिरन्यस्य विशेषयुक्ता ।
यस्योभयं साधु स शिक्षकाणां धुरि प्रतिष्ठापयितव्य एव ॥"

इति श्रीकालिदासवचनं सर्वदा पुरः स्थापनीयम् । अपि चाध्यापकस्योत्साहशीलता रसज्ञता चाविरताध्ययनेन सद्ग्रन्थानाम् । अधिगतविश्वविद्यालयोपाधिभिः शास्त्रिभिः शिक्षकैर्महाविद्यालयेष्ववर्त [illegible] तत्प्राय उपलब्धाभावनन्तरं साहित्यद्रुमगच्छति कालव्यवधानादपुनरावृत्तिवशाच्च । तस्मात्तैरध्ययनगतवाताभ्यासनिगमार्थं सततमध्ययनशीलैर्भाव्यमिति नितरामुपयुक्तमेव । गीर्वाणभाषायाः स्वभावसौन्दर्यं तेषु तेषु महाकाव्यनाटकादिग्रन्थेषु कथं व्यक्ततामागतम्, प्रकृतिसुन्दर [illegible] भावविचाररत्नानि तैस्तैः कविप्रवरैर्निहितानि [illegible] इत्येतत्कृत्स्नमध्यमस्कृदध्ययनादृते न [illegible] ज्ञातुं मूलग्रन्थवाचनं सम्यगर्थविवृतिः [illegible] एवं मल्लिनाथादिटीकाकृताम् [illegible] समाश्रिता सती छात्रहिताय कल्पते । [illegible]

प्राचीनग्रन्थार्थं प्रतिपादयन्ति, ऐतिह्याचारविधीनां किं रहस्यं कथयन्तीत्येतदपि गीर्वाणभाषाध्यापकेन संद्रष्टव्यम्। एतच्च ज्ञानं यथा शिष्याणां श्रुतिविषयं दृष्टिविषयं च सुगमतयाऽऽगच्छेत्तथा तेन प्रयतनीयम्। एवमेव पूर्वाचारविचाराणामाधुनिकाचारविचाराणां च सम्बन्धश्छात्राणां मतिं सौकर्येणाधिरोक्ष्यति। भारतीयाचारधर्मस्य सम्यग्बोधनायाध्यापकेन च्छात्रेभ्यः प्राचीनैतिह्यान्यपि यथावसरं कथनीयानि। काव्यविवरणसमकालमेव यथासम्भवं कविचरितानि कथयितव्यानि। कदाचित्काव्यनाटकानां सारग्राहिणी समीक्षापि कार्या। सा यथा—काव्यनिर्माणकाले किं कवेर्मनसोऽधिष्ठानं, के के गुणाश्च तस्य तस्य कवेः प्रतिभाविशेषं प्रदर्शयन्तीत्येतेषां विषयाणां सम्यगालोचनमपि प्रत्येकमध्यापकेन यथाप्रसङ्गमनुष्ठेयम्। प्रौढच्छात्राध्यापने न वाक्यानां श्लोकानां वा वाच्यार्थमात्रज्ञापनं पर्याप्तं भविष्यति, किन्तु शब्दान्तर्हितो यः कोऽप्यपूर्वो व्यञ्जनारूपोऽर्थस्तं रुच्या स्वयमेव प्रथममास्वाद्य पुनः स शिष्याणां पुरतः सकौशलमाविष्कार्यः। यद्येतत्सकलमप्यध्यापकस्य कर्तव्यत्वेनापतति तर्हि तेन यथानिर्देशं पूर्वसूरिग्रन्थानधीत्य ते तेऽध्यापकगुणाः सम्पादनीया एव।

नाटकवाचने शिक्षकेण विशिष्टपदवाक्प्रयोगाः संवादप्रकारा वाक्प्रचाराश्च सविशेषमभ्यसनीया येन तदानीन्तनानां संवादरीतिं विज्ञाय स्वीये सम्भाषणे लेखने वा नाटकस्थानि सुश्लिष्टपदानि सामीचीन्येन प्रयोक्तुं स प्रभविष्यति। एषा ग्रन्थाध्ययननिरतिरध्यापनकालेऽविरतस्यन्दिन्या मधुरभाषया परिणमेत्फलदायिनी च भवेच्छात्राणामित्यत्र नास्ति संशयलेशावकाशः। यावन्मात्रमध्यापकः पूर्वसूरिग्रन्थाध्ययननिरतः स्यात्तावन्मात्रं तस्य वाक्पाटवं प्रागल्भ्यमुपागत्य च्छात्राणां संस्कृताध्ययने रतिं जनयिष्यति। अभ्यासेनैवैतत्सर्वं सुकरं भवति। 'स्वाध्यायप्रवचनाभ्यां न प्रमदितव्यम्' इत्युपनिषद्वचनमध्यापकैः सततमभ्यसनशीलैर्भाव्यमित्यस्मत्सिद्धान्तमुपोद्बलयति।

अन्यदपि किञ्चिद्वक्तव्यमत्र यद्गीर्वाणभाषाध्यायिनः प्रायो विविक्तसेविनो मितभाषिणश्च दृश्यन्ते। विशेषतोऽभिधेयमत्र यत् "प्रायः समानविद्याः परस्परयशःपुरोभागाः" इति कालिदासोक्तेर्निदर्शनभूता आत्मानमेव कृतार्थं मन्यमानाः केचन प्राच्यपण्डिताः सरसग्रन्थविरचनमतिं विहाय यत्र कुत्राप्यन्येषामधरोत्तरव्यक्तावेव स्वरुचिमाविष्कुर्वन्ति। महदेतच्चित्रं यत्सासूयाः

परस्परकुत्सापरितुष्टाश्चेमे परेषां वैदुष्यविषयेऽकारणमेव कृपणमतित्वं प्रकटयन्ति, तेषामधःपातनायापि यथा कथञ्चित्प्रयतन्ते च। अधुनातनकालनिदाघेन कृशीभूताया संस्कृतवाक्स्रोतस्विन्यामियं प्रवृत्तिर्न कमपि गुणमावहति, प्रत्युतात्मनाशायैव कल्पते। अतः सर्वैः संस्कृतानुरागिभिः 'संहतिः कार्यसाधिका' इति वचनं संस्मृत्य स्वदोषपरिमार्जनाय पतत्रिलघ्वारन्यायेन गीर्वाणवाक्प्रसाराय च प्रयतितव्यम्। तैः प्रतिनगरं संस्कृतसाहित्यसभाः संस्थापयितव्याः, यासु कमपि रुचिरविषयमधिकृत्य संस्कृतव्याख्यानानि संविधेयानि, रम्याः संस्कृतकथाः कथनीयाः, संस्कृतनाटकस्थाः समुत्कृष्टप्रवेशाश्च नाटयितव्याः। तादृशीषु सभासु छात्राणामप्यध्यापकैः सार्धं संविभागोऽस्तु येनाध्यापकानामध्यापनपाटवं वृद्धिं प्राप्स्यति छात्राणामपि संस्कृताध्ययने समुचितरुचिरुत्पत्स्यते च॥

प्राच्यप्रतीच्यशिक्षापद्धतिसमीक्षा।

भारताभ्युदयसाधिका का शिक्षापद्धतिर्भवेदित्यत्र विषये बहवः पाश्चात्यविद्याविलुब्धमानसाश्चिन्तनचतुरा जना विविधोपायांश्चिन्तयन्ति। किन्तु यस्यां भाषामञ्जूषायां भारतीयसंस्कृतिरत्नान्यन्तर्हितानि तस्या गीर्वाणवाण्या मृतत्वहेयत्वे प्रमाणीकृत्य पाश्चात्यैकविद्याप्रसारमेव परमोत्कृष्टोपायं मन्यमाना इमे वनात्तरोर्मूलं परिहृत्य शाखा जलेन सिञ्चन्ति, स्वपितरौ विस्मृत्यान्येषां कृतकपुत्रत्वं परिगृह्णन्ति, प्रकृतिं परित्यज्य वा विकृतिमुररीकुर्वन्तीत्युक्तिर्न प्रायोऽसामञ्जस्यमावहेत्। विशालतरभारतीयगोष्ठीषु मन्त्रं च सुरवागध्ययनसंसक्तचेतःसु सत्स्वपि केषुचित्पाश्चात्यपण्डितेषु, प्रतीच्यविद्यैकशरणाः केचन भारतीयविद्वांसो मेकॉलेमहोदयो[illegible] [illegible] श्रद्दधानाः प्राच्यविद्यापरिवादरताश्च परिदृश्यन्त [illegible] कालवैपरीत्यम्। [illegible] व्यसने केचन नयनगोचरीभवन्ति [illegible] संस्कृतपण्डिताः [illegible]

षिता अपि विनीतवेषाः, सरस्वतीनिकेतनायमाना अपि निजगुणप्रख्यापने मूकाः, विविधशास्त्राध्ययने कृतभूरिपरिश्रमा अप्यलब्धपर्याप्तधनाः, अधना अपि मानधनाः, पाश्चात्यैकपक्षपातिभिश्च तृणाय मन्यमानाः सन्ति ।

सन्तु नाम केऽपि दोषाः संस्कृतविदुषाम् । पदपदार्थव्याख्यानपुरस्सरं प्राङ्क्तग्रन्थविवेचने तेषामप्रतिमैव प्रतिभा विद्योतत इत्यत्र नास्ति सन्देहलवोऽपि । प्राच्यानामध्ययनाध्यापनपद्धतिर्बहुशो मुखाधिष्ठिता, न केवलं ग्रन्थाधिष्ठिता । तेषां न तथा पल्लवग्राहिपाण्डित्ये समादरो, यथा विद्यते मूलग्राहिपाण्डित्ये, येन ते ग्रन्थगतं प्रधानविषयं यथायथं प्रवक्तुं पारयन्ति । एषैव प्राच्यविद्वद्गुणसम्पदतन्द्रितेन मनसा परिरक्षणीयेति सुतरामावश्यकम् ।

नात्रास्मासु प्राच्यपण्डितगुणैकपक्षपातित्वं स्वदोषनिगूहनपरत्वं वाऽध्यारोपयन्तु मनीषिणः । प्राच्यगुणेष्विव प्रतीच्यगुणेष्वपि वयं बद्धादराः । यथा पाश्चात्यपण्डिताः संस्कृतग्रन्थाध्ययने सारग्राहिणीं विचिकित्सापद्धतिं समवलम्ब्य स्थलकालेतिवृत्तादिविमर्शपूर्वकं गवेषणापूर्णान् सिद्धान्तानुपपादयितुमीशते, न तथा पौरस्त्यपण्डिताः । प्राच्यविद्वांसो विश्लेषणपद्धतिमाश्रित्य काव्यगतश्लोकानामेकैकशो रसभावालङ्कारविवरणे मतिप्रकर्षमाविष्कुर्वन्ति । पाश्चात्यरसज्ञास्त्वन्यादृशीमेव काव्यसमीक्षापद्धतिं प्रकटयन्ति । संश्लेषणपद्धत्या तस्य तस्य कवेः काव्यजातमालोड्य शब्दान्तर्हिता विविधप्रवृत्तीः संपरीक्ष्य च तस्य तस्य मनसो मूलाधिष्ठानं सङ्कलनेनाभिव्यङ्क्तुं काव्यरसमास्वादयितुं च ते क्षमाः । दर्शनशास्त्रेषु तौलनिकीमैतिहासिकीं च पद्धतिमङ्गीकृत्य कलुषमतयः सन्तोऽपि ते विभिन्नसंस्कृतिसाधर्म्यं तत्तत्सिद्धान्ततुल्यत्वं च प्रदर्शयितुं प्रयतन्ते । संस्कृतानुशीलनमूलकं नूतनं भाषाशास्त्रं समुद्भाव्य तद्बलेन वेदवाङ्मयार्थनिर्धारणे कृतसमुद्यमाः पाश्चात्याः प्रस्खलन्तोऽपि प्रशंसाभाजनं खलु । अद्यत्वे तु 'स्थाणुरयं भारहारः किलाभूदधीत्य वेदं न विजानाति योऽर्थम्' इत्युक्तिं सार्थतां नयतां वैदिकधर्मानुयायिनां वर्धत एव वेदार्थविषयेऽज्ञानविलसितम् । अधुना भारतीयपण्डितानां मतिर्वेदाङ्गानामेकदेशमात्राध्ययने पर्यवसिता दरीदृश्यते, न तु साक्षाद्वेदाध्ययने । विरला एव तादृशा अनेकशास्त्रजलपूतमानसाः पदवाक्यप्रमाणज्ञा विद्वद्धौरेया यादृशाः पूर्वं प्राचुर्येणाध्यगम्यन्त । वर्तमान-

यतान्यां भारते प्रायः पदज्ञापकव्याकरणैकशास्त्रस्य, वाक्यज्ञापकमीमांसैक-शास्त्रस्य प्रमाणज्ञापकन्यायशास्त्रमात्रस्य वाऽध्ययने यापितबहुवत्सराः पण्डिताः समजायन्त। पौरस्त्यविद्वांसश्च मूलग्रन्थविवेचने निपुणतमाः सन्तोऽपि ग्रन्थसम्बन्धिनः स्थलकालेतिवृत्ताद्यानुषङ्गिकविषयान्न जानन्ति, न वा तत्र समवदधते। तेऽभिप्रयन्ति यद् "नैतादृशैर्विषयैरस्मदीयं प्रयोजनम्। एतदन्वेषणं नूनं काकदन्तगवेषणमेव जलताडनप्रकारो वा। पुष्परसपानं परित्यज्य किमेतया कुसुमदलपरिगणनया" इति। पक्षैकावलम्बिनी नैषा प्राच्यपण्डितोक्तिरुपादेयतामर्हतीति सुव्यक्तमेव। अतो दृष्टिसङ्कोचं दूरी-कुर्वाणा विततालोकं विदधाना च प्रतीच्यानामध्ययनाध्यापनपद्धतिः पौरस्त्यपण्डितैरवश्यमभ्युपगन्तव्या।

एतस्य तु प्रतीच्यपद्धतिविज्ञानस्याऽऽङ्ग्लभाषादिगतग्रन्थनिष्ठत्वात् तत्पद्धतिपरिचयस्तत्तद्भाषाज्ञानमपेक्षते। विभिन्नभाषाधिगमस्य पुनः कति-पयजनानामेव सुकरत्वात् तत्तद्भाषानभिज्ञानां कृते विविधभाषाकुशलैस्त-त्पद्धतिविद्भिः संस्कृतेन मातृभाषया वा तादृशग्रन्थविरचने मतिः कार्या, येन संस्कृतादिवाङ्मयमपि परमां स्फीतिमियात्। इदं त्वत्रावधेयं यन्मूल-ग्रन्थाध्ययनादृते पद्धतिप्रयोगविज्ञानमात्रमकिञ्चित्करमेव। संलक्ष्यते हि मोघत्वं मूलग्रन्थाध्ययनविहीनस्य पद्धतिविज्ञानमात्रस्य पाश्चात्यसम्प्रदायिषु विश्वविद्यालयेषु, यत्र संस्कृताध्ययनेऽप्याङ्ग्लभाषाव्यवहारस्य सर्वमूर्धन्यत्वा-त्संस्कृतमूलग्रन्थानां पाङ्क्तज्ञानं न यथावदधिगन्तुं पार्यते। पर्याप्तसंस्कृत-ज्ञानासत्त्वेऽपि पाश्चात्यग्रन्थैकशरणास्तत्रत्या भारतीयच्छात्राः पद्धतिविज्ञान-वशादेव संस्कृतपरीक्षाः सम्यक्समुत्तीर्य प्राच्यविद्वद्दृशा पल्लवग्राहिपण्डित-कोटिमाटीकन्त इति नितरामुपपन्नमेव।

नात्र केनापि मन्तव्यं यत्कृपणमतिता मतग्रहिलता वा प्राच्यविदुषा-मेव व्यवच्छेदिकेति। उपरितनकोटिमवगाहमाना आङ्ग्लोपपदधारिणोऽपि गाधज्ञानवशाद् गीर्वाणवाणीं शास्त्रिवरेण्यांश्चानुपयुक्तान्मन्वाना दृष्टिसङ्कोचं दुराराध्यत्वं च प्रकटयन्तीत्यतः पाश्चात्यपद्धतिविज्ञानमेव केवलमालोकं विस्तारयतीति मास्तु कस्यापि मिथ्याग्रहः। वरमत्र प्राच्यपण्डितानां प्राचीनसम्प्रदायसंरक्षकमनेकसंशयोच्छेदि परोक्षार्थदर्शकं च शास्त्रैकाध्ययन-

परत्वं, न पुनः परम्परोच्छेदि प्रत्यक्षार्थमात्रदर्शकं दुराराध्यताजनकं च पाश्चात्यसम्प्रदायानुसारित्वमिति नो मतिः। 'उपयुक्तत्व'—पदेनोदरभरणक्षमत्वमेवावबुध्येत चेदिदानीं संस्कृतविद्येवाङ्ग्लविद्यापि कथमनुपयुक्तत्वं न भजेत। तदर्थं क्षपितविपुलधना आङ्ग्लोपाधिधारिणः कति जना पर्याप्तजीविकां लब्धुं प्रभवन्तीत्याङ्ग्लविद्याभिमानिनः प्रष्टव्याः। तस्मादुपयुक्तत्वविषये प्राच्यविद्या प्रतीच्यविद्या चासंशयं तुल्यकक्षतामेवाधिरोहत इत्यस्मदाशयः।

महदेकं विषादस्थानं यत्संस्कृतवाङ्मयमधिकृत्य केचन भारतीयपण्डिता अपि नूतनसिद्धान्तसमन्वितान् स्वीयग्रन्थानाङ्ग्लभाषयैव विरचयन्ति, येन सुरभारती वञ्चितोपोषिता सती मुमूर्षुत्वमापद्यते। अद्यत्वे पद्यपरिपुष्टे संस्कृतवाङ्मये न तावती पद्यप्रणयनस्यावश्यकता प्रतिभाति, यावती सरससरलानां गद्यकाव्यकथानामभिनवसिद्धान्तसमेतानां गद्यप्रबन्धानां च। अतो 'गद्यं कवीनां निकषं वदन्ति' इति वचनमनुस्मृत्य तत्तद्वाङ्मयविधानिपुणैः सुरसरस्वतीश्रेयःसाधने प्रयतितव्यम्। एतद्ग्रन्थविरचनायान्यादृशा एव पण्डिता अपेक्ष्यन्ते, ये काव्यशास्त्रादीनां प्रगाढानुशीलनप्रभावात्संस्कृताभिभाषणलेखनवैदग्ध्यं प्रकाशयन्तः पाश्चात्यपद्धतिप्रयोगपटवोऽपि भविष्यन्ति। एवं प्रतीच्यपण्डितपद्धतिसनाथं प्राच्यानां मूलग्राहिपाण्डित्यमनल्पफलाय कल्पेतेत्यत्र नास्ति संशयावकाशः।

अतो दोषवर्जमुभयविधविद्यागतानां गुणानां परिरक्षणोपायभूतानि कानिचन वस्तून्यत्र प्रस्तूयन्ते—

१ साहित्यव्याकरणन्यायमीमांसावेदान्तधर्मशास्त्रायुर्वेदादिविषयाणां सम्यगध्ययनाय वाराणसीविहारकालिकास्थानलवपुरमद्रादिविभागेषु यथा संस्कृतमहाविद्यालया राजशासनानुरोधेन प्रतिष्ठापितपूर्वाः सन्ति, तथा मोहमयीविभागेऽपि राजशासनानुमत्या संस्कृतमहाविद्यालयः प्रतिष्ठापयितव्यः। अत्रार्थशास्त्रराजनीतिशिल्पशास्त्रज्यौतिषसङ्गीताद्युपयुक्तविषया अपि पाठ्यक्रमे सन्निवेश्याः। तौलनिकज्ञानसौकर्यार्थं संस्कृतव्यवहारप्रधानेन शास्त्राध्ययनेन साकं तत्र च्छात्राणामाङ्ग्लभाषाया अपि ज्ञानं प्रवेशपरीक्षापर्यन्तं वैकल्पिकं भवतु। शास्त्रनैपुण्योपाधिमधिगत्य वा छात्रैराङ्ग्लभाषाऽध्येतव्या।

२ पाश्चात्यविद्यासम्पादनार्थं प्रतिप्रान्तं प्रतिष्ठापितेषु भारतवर्षीयविश्वविद्यालयेषु पाश्चात्यविद्याविभागेन सार्धं प्रकल्पितो विद्यते प्राच्यविद्याविभागोऽपि (Oriental Faculty) यत्र प्राच्यविद्यानैपुण्यलिप्सूनां कृते 'एम्. ओ. एल्.'– परीक्षा शास्त्रिशिरोमण्यादिपरीक्षाश्च तत्तद्विश्वविद्यालयद्वारैव व्यवस्थापिताः। तथा मोहमयीविश्वविद्यालयसमित्यापि प्राच्यविद्याविभागं प्रकल्प्य परीक्षोपक्रमः कार्यः। अत्र परीक्षाप्रश्नोत्तराणि संस्कृतभाषयैव च्छात्रैर्लेखनीयानीति विधिर्विधेयः। संस्कृतविषये 'पीएच्. डी.'–उपाधिलाभार्थे विरचनीयः प्रबन्धः संस्कृतेनैव लेखनीय इत्यपि नियमो गीर्वाणभाषासमुत्कर्षाय विधातव्यः।

३ मोहमयीविश्वविद्यालयीयसंस्कृतपरीक्षास्वाङ्ग्लभाषैव मूर्धन्यपदं भजते। प्राच्यविद्याविषये पाश्चात्यैराङ्ग्लभाषाया लिखितं वाङ्मयं छात्रैरवश्यमध्येयं, पाश्चात्यानां विचिकित्सापूर्णा गवेषणापद्धतिरपि स्वायत्तीकार्या। किन्तु संस्कृतपरीक्षासु च्छात्रैः प्रत्यङ्कशतं पञ्चाशदङ्कपरिमितानां प्रश्नानामुत्तराणि संस्कृतभाषयैव लेखनीयानि, अवशिष्टानि च मातृभाषयाऽऽङ्ग्लभाषया वेति वैकल्पिको विधिर्विधेयः। संस्कृतोपाधिपरीक्षायाः कश्चिदंशो मौखिक एव भवतु वर्णोच्चारसंस्कृतसंलापादिशक्तिपरीक्षार्थम्।

४ संस्कृतमहाविद्यालयोपाधिधारिणां विदुषां राजशासनद्वारा जीविकोपायाः परिकल्पनीयाश्चेत्ते यथापूर्वं प्रत्याङ्ग्लपाठशालं प्रत्याङ्ग्लमहाविद्यालयं च संस्कृताध्यापकपदे नियोक्तव्याः। अध्यापकपदनियोजनात्पूर्वं संस्कृतपण्डितैरप्यध्यापनमहाविद्यालये वर्षमात्रमध्यापनशास्त्रनैपुण्यं सम्पादनीयमिति नियमो विधेयः। तेषां मासिकी वृत्तिश्चेतरविषयाध्यापकवृत्तेरन्यूना भवतु।

५ भारतीयसंस्कृतिरक्षणे गीर्वाणवाण्या महत्त्वं समवबुध्य भारतीयनृपैः सम्प्रदायाचार्यैः श्रेष्ठिभिरन्यैर्वा जनैः स्वप्रेरणया प्रतिनगरं संस्कृतपाठशालाः प्रतिष्ठापनीयाः, प्रचलितपूर्वाश्च संरक्षणीयाः। पाठशालानां पर्यवेक्षकपदे राजशासनानुरोधेन नियोक्तव्यः प्राच्यप्रतीच्यविद्यानिपुणः पण्डितो यस्याभिमतानुसारेण राज्यशासकैः पाठशालासञ्चालकाः समुचितसाहाय्यधनदानेन परिपोषणीयाः। एतासु पाठशालासु प्रायः संस्कृतमहाविद्यालयोपाधिमन्तः शास्त्रपारङ्गता विद्वांसोऽध्यापकपदे नियोक्तव्याः।

६ आङ्ग्लमहाविद्यालयपाठ्यक्रमे पर्याप्तव्याकरणज्ञानाय पाणिनीयपरिभाषापरिचयाय च बी. ए. परीक्षापर्यन्तं लघुकौमुद्या मध्यकौमुद्याश्च पठनपाठनयोर्नान्तरीयकत्वं परिगणनीयमिति नूतनो विधिर्मोहमयीविश्वविद्यालयसमित्या स्वनियमावल्यां समावेश्यः।

७ संस्कृतभाषाप्रसाराय मोहमयीमण्डले तेषु तेषु नगरेषु प्रतिवत्सरं संस्कृतसाहित्यसंमेलनं सम्पद्यतामिति हेतोः सम्मेलनान्तर्गतविविधकार्यदर्शिका चिरस्थायिनी विद्वत्समितिरेका संस्थाप्या, या नियतशुल्कप्रदानपूर्वकं संस्कृतप्रणयिभिः सदस्यैः संवर्धनीया। प्रतिनगरं च स्थापनीया गीर्वाणवाग्वर्धिन्यसभाः याः संस्कृतसाहित्यपरिषत्संस्थया सङ्गच्छन्ताम्।

८ संस्कृतस्य सार्वजनीनप्रचारार्थं संस्कृतानुरागोत्पादनार्थं च चिरस्थायिन्या विद्वत्समित्या हिन्दीप्रचारसंस्थावद् व्युत्पत्तिपरीक्षात्रयं प्रकल्पनीयं, यस्मिन् सुगमरीत्या प्रौढाप्रौढैः सामान्यजनैरपि वर्षत्रयाभ्यन्तरे संस्कृतभाषायां व्युत्पन्नत्वं सम्पादितं स्यात्।

९ गीर्वाणभाषाप्रचारसौकर्यार्थमाङ्ग्लशब्दस्थाने आधुनिकः विविधव्यवहारोचितानां नूतनसंस्कृतपर्यायाणां निर्माणं नितरामावश्यकम्। तदर्थमेका विद्वत्समितिरधिकर्तव्या, याऽऽधुनिकसंस्कृतवाङ्मये प्रयुक्तपूर्वान् पर्यायान् सङ्कलय्य नूतनसमुचितपर्यायांश्च निर्माय शब्दसूचीं प्रकाशयेत्। एषा सूची प्रान्तीयभाषावैभवसंवर्धनायापि भवेदिति सन्देहातीतमेव।

१० आङ्ग्लदेशीयैराङ्ग्लभाषाया जागतिकप्रसाराय तस्या मौलिकं (Basic) स्वरूपं कल्पयित्वा ८५० सङ्ख्याका उपयुक्ततमाः शब्दाः सङ्कलिताः सन्ति। तादृशीमेव रीतिमाश्रित्य कयापि विद्वत्समित्याऽध्ययनसौलभ्याय संस्कृतभाषागतान्युपयुक्ततमानि पदानि परिगणय्य सङ्कलनीयानि। तान्येव पदानि प्रयुज्य बालोपयोगीनि संस्कृतपाठ्यपुस्तकानि विरचयितव्यानि च॥

पद्धतितारतम्यम्।

प्रारम्भिके गीर्वाणभाषाध्यापने हृदयङ्गमत्वमिन्द्रियग्राह्यत्वम् (Concreteness) आनुपूर्वी (Gradation) परिमितशब्दसङ्ग्रहोऽभिनयवैपुल्यं

छात्रचित्तरञ्जकाश्च विषया इत्येतानि संवादपद्धतितत्त्वान्युपादेयानि । एष संवादपद्धतितत्त्वाश्रय आङ्ग्लभाषाध्यापनपद्धतेरनुकरणमात्रमिति मास्तु कस्याप्यकारणमन्यथाग्रहः । पाश्चात्यानां बालमनोविज्ञानानुसारीणि यान्यनवद्यानि भाषाभ्यासतत्त्वानि तान्येवोपास्यानि संस्कृताध्यापने, न त्वितराणीति वयमत्राभिप्रेमः । यस्य कस्याप्यनवद्यवस्तुनोऽङ्गीकारो न कदापि दोषाय, प्रत्युत हितायैव भवतीति जानन्त्येव सदसद्व्यक्तिहेतवः 'परीक्ष्यान्यतरद्भजमानाः' सन्तः । एषा संवादपद्धतिर्भारतीयैरविदितपूर्वा काचिन्नूतना सरणिरित्यपि न वयं मन्यामहे । भारतीयैरेषा परिपाटी कदाचिदविकलतया नानुसृता स्यात् । किन्तु तस्या मूलरहस्यमाविष्कुर्वदधस्तनमवतरणं तर्कसङ्ग्रहदीपिकायामुपलभ्यते । यथा—

"शक्तिग्रहश्च वृद्धव्यवहारेण । व्युत्पित्सुर्बालो 'गामानय' इत्युत्तमवृद्धवाक्यश्रवणानन्तरं मध्यमवृद्धस्य प्रवृत्तिमुपलभ्य गवानयनं च दृष्ट्वा मध्यमवृद्धप्रवृत्तिजनकज्ञानस्यान्वयव्यतिरेकाभ्यां वाक्यजन्यत्वं निश्चित्य 'अश्वमानय' 'गां बधान' इति वाक्यान्तर आवापोद्वापाभ्यां गोपदस्य गोत्वविशिष्टे शक्तिरश्वशब्दस्याश्वत्वविशिष्टे शक्तिरिति व्युत्पद्यते ।"

अतः संवादपद्धतिसमाश्रयः केवलं पाश्चात्यानुकरणमिति न केनापि मन्तव्यम् । रुचिवैचित्र्याद्विविधाध्यापनपद्धतीरनुसरद्भिः सर्वैरपि शिक्षकैः सततमृजुचेतसा छात्रहितायैव प्रयतितव्यमिति सन्देहातीतमेव । संवादपद्धतिसदृशा ये ये पन्थानश्छात्रहिताय कल्पन्ते ते तेऽखिला अपि शुभा एवेति स्वीकृते मास्तु कोऽपि विवादावसरः । किन्तु तेषु शुभेष्वपि यत्तारतम्यं तद्विवेकार्हं भवति ।

अत्र संवादपद्धतिविषयेऽश्रद्दधानाः केचिद्वदन्ति यत्संस्कृताध्यापने संवादपद्धतिसमाश्रयोऽनैसर्गिको, यतः संस्कृतभाषाया दैनिकव्यवहारेष्वनुपयुज्यमानत्वान्मृतत्वाद्वा तस्याः प्रकृतिसुभगं संलापस्वरूपनिदर्शनं न कुत्राप्यधुनाधिगम्यते । अन्यच्च संस्कृताध्ययने छात्राणां संवादक्षमत्वोत्पादनं नादिमं प्रयोजनं, किन्तु पूर्वतनभारतीयसंस्कृतेः परिचयार्थं सम्यग्वाचनपूर्वकमर्थनिर्धारणक्षमत्वजननमेव प्रमुखं प्रयोजनम् । संवादक्षमत्वनिर्माणकर्मणोऽर्थावगमक्षमत्वोत्पादनस्य सुकरतरत्वात्संवादपद्धत्यनुसरणं निष्प्रयोजनं

सूरिभिश्चालङ्कृतत्वाच्च । पुनश्चाद्यापि सर्वत्रैव विद्वद्भिः प्रयुज्यते तत्र तथा योग्यं संस्कृतं यथा कालिदासबाणादीनां ग्रन्थेषूपलभ्यते । अध्यापने च प्रत्यक्षबोधकं भाषाङ्गीकारविधावेदनलाघवकं भवति तदर्थमेकान्ततः किन्तावो गीर्वाणवाणीव्यवहारो न किमपि कल्पनामर्हति । अपि च संवादनकल्पना श्रुणावहत्वं यतो निपुणाध्यापकसाध्यं ततः संस्कृतसंभाषणप्रियैः पाश्चात्यविद्वद्भिः वा प्रवृत्तिरस्तु यतन्त इति ।

अत्रोच्यते तद्विषयं स्पष्टीक्रियते यत्र वयं संवादनप्रतिषेधातिरिक्ताभिप्रायिणो, नापि च सर्वेणैव छात्राणां संवादपाठविधिना पुनरुक्तिलिपि मन्यामहे । न च पाश्चात्यच्छात्राणां विषये संभाषणकौशलप्राप्तृत्वहेतुः, अपि तु मात्रेतरभाषाधिगमपूर्वकं तत्प्रयोजनमस्तीत्यर्थः प्रयोजनमस्तीत्यम् । यावत् कालः संस्कृताध्ययनार्थं लभ्यते तावताऽल्पीयसा कालेन छात्राः संवादनकल्पां ल्योक्तुमपारयन्ति न संस्कृतमाध्यम संवलितं पाठ्यपुस्तकमध्येतुं नो शक्नुयुः । न पुनः सर्वेऽपि संस्कृतच्छात्राः संस्कृतमाध्यमेनाध्यापनीयाः, न वा तेषु मातृभाषोपयोगो न कदापि कार्य इत्यत्राभिनिवेशः । अस्तु तत्रापि व्याकरणाद्युपदेशावसरे मातृभाषयैवाध्यापनं तत्प्रयोगाद् भवत इति विवादस्य नो मतिः । बाल्याध्यापनेऽपि पुस्तकस्थवाक्यादिबोधनाय भावाङ्गीकारविधावेदनाय व्याकरणविवेचनाय च मातृभाषा एव नियन्तृत्वे स्पष्टं प्रयत्नतरो भाति । किन्तु संवादनकल्पना सैषा विषयविशुद्धैर्यत्नैः ... तात्पर्यतः किञ्चिदुपेक्ष्यते ।

व्यावहारिकभाषात्वेन प्रत्याहारेण विविधविषयाणां भाषान्तरेषु विकासेन ... गीर्वाणवाणी दैनिकव्यवहारे ... यदि सम्प्रति ... भवत इति प्रश्नः । किन्तु या नूतना ... विचारणीयं वस्तु पुनरपि विचिन्त्यम् । ... यथा 'ओक् टेबिल्' इत्येतादृशो ... न ... प्राप्नोति ... गीर्वाणवाण्या ... जनाः । न तथा ... यथा 'ओक् टेबिल्' इत्येतादृशीनां भाषाणां, यतः ...

भारतीयसंस्कृतिरधिरमद्यापि वहति भारतीयानां धमनीषु । सर्वेऽपि वैदिकधर्मानुयायिनां नित्यनैमित्तिकानि धार्मिककर्माणि संस्कृतभाषयैवाधुनापि विधीयन्ते । धार्मिकव्यवहारेषु प्रयुज्यमानाया एतस्याः संस्कृतभाषायाः सुबोधत्वं कृतिदर्शनपूर्वकमुच्चार्यमाणैर्वाक्यैः सुष्ठु प्रतीयते। दैनिकव्यवहारेष्वपि विविधप्रान्तस्थैर्गीर्वाणभाषापण्डितैरन्योन्यबोधनार्थं संलापग्रन्थविरचनादिषु गीर्वाणवाणेवोपयुज्यमाना दृश्यते । सांलापिकसंस्कृतस्य च निसर्गमधुरं निदर्शनं संस्कृतनाटकेषु भूयिष्ठमुपलभ्यते । अपरं च संस्कृतोद्भूतासु विविध-प्रान्तीयभाषासु प्रतिशतं प्रायः षष्टिसङ्ख्याकानां शुद्धसंस्कृतशब्दानां सद्भावात्, आधुनिकव्यवहारोचितनूतनशब्दनिर्माणेन प्रान्तीयभाषावैभव-संवर्धने चालङ्कर्मीणत्वान्मातृस्थानीयेयं गीर्वाणवाणी सम्प्रत्यपि जीवन्ती तिष्ठति । इत्थंभूते व्यतिकरे कथं केचिज्जनाः सुरवरस्वस्या मृतत्वं प्रमाणी-कुर्वन्तीति त एव जानन्तु महाभागाः ।

शिक्षकैरध्यापने प्रयुज्यमानं संस्कृतं कालिदासबाणादीनां संस्कृतमिव न शोभनमित्युच्येत चेद्वयमत्र प्रत्युत्तरामो यन्न सर्वेऽपि कालिदासबाणा-दयः । निखिलेऽपि संस्कृतवाङ्मये कालिदासबाणादयोऽङ्गुलिमेया एव नव-नवोन्मेषशालिनः कविप्रवराः । तान् हित्वा पतत्प्रिंसङ्ख्यारन्यायेन यैर्विद्वद्भिः संलापग्रन्थप्रणयनादिकर्म कृतं तेषां सर्वोऽपि समुद्यमो नितान्तं निष्प्रयोजन-स्तेषां ग्रन्थाश्च सर्वथा सुदूरमपास्या इत्युक्तिर्न किञ्चिदपि सामञ्जस्यमर्हति । गैर्वाणी वाणी न केवलमेकविधरीतेः किन्तु विविधरीतीनां निदर्शनम् । एतासां विविधरीतीनां सततानुशीलनं शिक्षकभाषायाः शोभनत्वं पुष्णीयात् । अपरं च गीर्वाणवाक्पण्डितानां संलापसरणिं श्रावं श्रावमपि शिक्षकः स्व-भाषां प्रागल्भ्यकोटिं नेतुं पारयति । गीर्वाणभाषाध्यापकेनैतदनुष्ठानं भूरि-क्लेशकरमसाध्यं निष्प्रयोजनं वा मन्येत चेत्स गीर्वाणभाषाध्यापकपदं कथ-मन्वर्थतया मण्डयिष्यति ? । अल्पवेतनत्वाज्जीविकाचिन्तासन्दानितैः सतत-मुदरपूर्तिकर्मव्यापृतत्वाच्चालब्धावसरैः सामान्याध्यापकैर्नैतत्कर्म विधातुं शक्यत इत्युच्येत चेद्वयमत्र प्रतिब्रूमो यदुपरितनसंवादपद्धतितत्त्वेष्वभ्युपग-तेषु न प्रगाढज्ञानमपेक्ष्यते संस्कृतभाषाया न चापि संलापकुशलत्वं तस्याम् ।

उक्तपूर्वमेवास्माभिर्यत्संलापपद्धतितत्त्वानामुपादेयत्वे सामान्यच्छात्राणां सम्यगर्थग्रहणपूर्वं वाचनक्षमत्वजननमेवास्मदीयमपि गीर्वाणभाषाध्यापन-

प्रयोजनमिति । किन्तु वाचनाध्यापनात्प्रागध्यापकेनानुसरणीयाः केऽप्यनिवार्याः क्रमाः, यैर्विना वाचनं न सामीचीन्येन कर्तुं शक्येत । संवादपद्धतिविषये केषांचिदन्यथाग्रहोऽस्ति यत्पाठ्यपुस्तकसाहाय्यं विना स्वतन्त्रतयैव च्छात्राध्यापकैः संस्कृतसंवादाः क्रियन्त इति । एतत्तु विपर्यस्तं मतं, यतो बालच्छात्रा न स्वातन्त्र्येण संवदितुं प्रभवन्ति प्रारम्भिके काले । तस्मात्पाठ्यपुस्तकगतपाठानुद्दिश्यैव कानिचन संवादपद्धतितत्त्वान्युपयोक्तव्यान्यध्यापने । तेषां तत्त्वानामनुसरणे हेतुस्त्वयं यदिदानीमाङ्ग्लपाठशालासु प्रतिवर्गं छात्राः प्रायः पञ्चत्रिंशत्सङ्ख्याकाः । बहुविधजातीयत्वात्तेषां वर्णोच्चाराः स्वसंस्कारानुगुणं प्रायो दोषसङ्कुलाः । संस्कृतवर्णोच्चारविषये च समधिकमवधानमपेक्ष्यत इति नैव निवेदनीयम् । अतोऽद्य यावत्क्षुण्णा व्याकरणप्रधानानुवादैकपदवी न च्छात्राणां श्रेयसे भवेत् । अनुवादैकपरिपाट्यामनुसृतायां छात्रास्तन्द्रालवोऽनवधानाश्च सम्पद्यन्त इति दरीदृश्यत एव सानुभवैः शिक्षकैः । अनया पद्धत्या बहवोऽध्यापकाः कथनैकपरिपाटीमवलम्ब्य पुस्तकस्थपाठांश्च वाचयित्वा पङ्क्तिशः स्वयमेवानुवादं कुर्वन्ति मातृभाषयाऽऽङ्ग्लभाषया वा, छात्रैश्च केवलमध्यापकोक्तं श्रोतव्यम् । अतश्छात्राणामकिञ्चित्करत्वादेव ते तन्द्रालवः सम्पद्यन्ते । अदत्तच्छात्रवाचनावकाशया चानया पद्धत्या छात्रा न कदापि वाचननैपुण्यमधिगन्तुं प्रभवन्ति । तस्मादियं क्लान्तिकरा पद्धतिर्हेया, छात्रसमवधानजनका काप्यन्या पद्धतिरुपादेया चेति सुनिर्णीतम् । येऽध्यापका आत्मनो मन्दौत्सुक्याद् व्याकरणप्रधानामनुवादैकपरिपाटीं सुकरां नैसर्गिकीं च मन्यन्ते त एव संवादपद्धतिं प्रभूतक्लेशकरामनैसर्गिकीं च पश्यन्ति । न ते पुनर्जानन्ति यदध्यापकदृशा या पद्धतिर्नैसर्गिकी सुकरा च सैव च्छात्रदृशा भूरिक्लेशावहा कृत्रिमा च, येन बहवश्छात्राः संस्कृताद्विरज्येतरभाषाध्ययनमवलम्बन्त इति ।

अतो बालच्छात्राणां संस्कृताध्ययनं प्रति समुचितप्रवृत्त्यनुरागोत्पादनार्थं संवादपद्धत्या उपरितनानि कानिचित्तत्त्वानि पाठ्यपुस्तकं समाश्रित्यानुसर्तव्यानि । तदनुरोधेन पुस्तकगतपाठस्य साक्षाद्वाचनात्प्राक् तं पाठमुद्दिश्य साभिनयभाषणप्रश्नादिरूपं मौखिकाध्यापनं कार्यमध्यापकेन, तदनु पौर्वापर्येण श्रवणोच्चारणप्रतिवचनरूपो भाषाभ्याससत्त्वानुसारी नैसर्गिकोऽनुक्रमोऽवलम्बनीयश्छात्रेण । अनेनोक्तिप्रत्युक्तिरूपव्यवहारेण च्छात्राः सोत्साहं सावधानं

न्चाध्याप्यमानविषयांशभाजो भवन्ति। पाठगतपदानां सन्दर्भसमन्वयपूर्वकं सङ्घशो व्यक्तिशश्चोच्चैरसकृदावर्तनं, लयस्वरसङ्क्रमविरामादिसमन्वितं साङ्घिकं वैयक्तिकं च वाचनं, संस्कृतप्रश्नद्वारा लब्धानां प्रतिवचनरूपाणां पाठगतवाक्यानां विविधच्छात्रैरर्थपरिग्रहपूर्वकं सुस्पष्टमुच्चारणमित्येतत्सकलमपि मौखिकमनुष्ठानं छात्राणां वर्णोच्चारशुद्धये, भाषापरिपाकनिष्पत्तये (Assimilation) साधुवाचनाय च कल्पते। अत्र नेत्रसंस्कारात्पूर्वं कर्णसंस्कारः, उच्चारणात्पूर्वं श्रवणम्, वाचनात्पूर्वं मौखिकमावर्तनम्, लेखनात्पूर्वं वाचनं चेति भाषाभ्यासतत्त्वस्थाऽऽनुपूर्वी समवधेया। एतन्मौखिकमावर्तनमपि स्वाध्यायशीलैर्भारतीयैः सुविदितपूर्वमेव। एतत्सकलमनुकरणप्रधानं कर्म यस्मिंश्छात्रा गुरुमनुकुर्वन्ति। गुरुजनव्यवहारानुकरणेनैव भाषाध्ययनं सुलभं भवति, न तु व्याकरणनियमज्ञानेनेति प्रथितं मनोविज्ञानाधिष्ठितं भाषाभ्यासतत्त्वम्।

अत्र संवादपद्धत्याः कानिचन तत्त्वान्येवाभ्युपगम्यन्ते, न तु साकल्येन संवादपद्धतिः प्रयुज्यत इति सुष्ठु विज्ञातं भवेद्विपश्चिद्भिः। पुस्तकगतपाठमधिकृत्य योऽनुयोगप्रतिवचनरूपो व्यवहारः स एवात्र संवादः। तस्मादस्याः परिपाट्याः 'संवादपद्धतिः' इत्यभिधानात् 'प्रश्नोत्तरपद्धतिः' 'खण्डान्वयपद्धतिः' इति वाभिधानं वरम्। उपरिवर्णितकल्पे संवादपद्धतिः (प्रश्नोत्तरपद्धतिः) कथनपद्धतिरनुवादपद्धतिरित्येताः सकला अपि यथाप्रसङ्गं प्रयुज्यन्तेऽध्यापने। तासां सर्वासां शोभनसमन्वयेनैव समीचीनोदर्केण भाव्यमिति नो मतम्। तस्मादियं परिपाटी 'सर्वसारग्राहिणी पद्धतिः' (Eclectic Method) इति नाम्नाभिधातव्या। प्रश्नविवरणादिकं संस्कृतमाश्रित्य कार्यमित्युक्ते, न तु सर्वेऽप्यध्यापका अस्य कर्मणः शक्ता इत्युच्येत चेद्वयमनुभूतिमधिष्ठाय प्रतिब्रूमो यदल्पाभ्यासवशमेवैतदनुष्ठानमिति। सटीकसंस्कृतमूलग्रन्थानामसकृद्वाचनेन शिक्षको भाषानैपुण्यमधिगत्याध्यापनकर्मापि रसोत्पादकं विधातुं प्रभवेदिति बलीयान्नो विश्वासः। प्रौढच्छात्राध्यापने पूर्वतनपण्डितैरनुसृता मल्लिनाथादिटीकाकृतामर्थविवृतिपद्धतिरीषत्परिवर्तितानुविधेया। परिवर्तनं त्वेतद्यत्कथनैकपरिपाटीं विहाय संस्कृतटीकाकृतां पद्धत्या सममनुयोगप्रतिवचनानुष्ठानरूपो नूतनः कल्पः समवल-

म्बनीयः। संस्कृतमाश्रित्य वक्तव्यमिति यद्यप्युक्तमत्र तथापि नैष सार्वत्रिको विधिः। यथाप्रसङ्गं मातृभाषापि विवरणार्थमुपयोज्येत्युक्तपूर्वमेव।

अध्यापनपटुत्वोपपदधारिभिः शिक्षकैरुपरिसूचितपद्धत्यनुसारिभिर्भाव्यमिति सुतरामाशास्यते। केचित्पद्धतिपटवोऽपि शिक्षका वदन्ति यद् "अध्यापनमहाविद्यालयेऽनुसृता पद्धतिरस्माभिः स्वकीयपाठशालासु नानुसर्तुं शक्यते। यत्रास्माकं प्रतिदिनं पञ्चषड्होरात्मकः कालोऽध्यापनकर्मणि व्यतीतो भवति, तत्र प्रतिपाठं टिप्पणीलेखनार्थमस्माभिः कथमवसरो लब्धव्यः। एतद्भूरिक्लेशवशात्कथमस्माभिः प्रतिदिनमविरतोत्साहैर्भवितव्यम्" इति। एषोक्तिर्नानुपपन्ना। किन्तु वयमेतद्वक्तुकामा यदध्यापनमहाविद्यालयगता पद्धतिः सतताभ्यासवशादध्यापकबुद्धौ सुस्थिरा सती प्रकृतिभावमापद्यते। इत्थंभूते पाठटिप्पणीलेखनप्रयोजनं नावशिष्टं भवति। उपपदलाभानन्तरं शिक्षका न केवलमध्यापनमहाविद्यालयस्थां गीर्वाणभाषाध्यापनपद्धतिमेव परित्यजन्ति, अपि त्वितरविषयाध्यापनपद्धतीरपीति सर्वजनविदिता परिस्थितिः। पद्धतिपटुरध्यापकोऽमन्दोत्साहश्छात्रहितनिरतश्चेत्स पाठटिप्पणीलेखनं विनापि स्वीयेनाध्यापनकर्मणा सर्वदैव च्छात्रचेतःसु पाठ्यविषये रतिं जनयेदित्यत्र नास्ति विवादावकाशः। अध्यापकः पुनर्मन्दोत्साहश्छात्रहितानवहितश्चेत्तदाध्यापनपटुत्वोपपदधारिणापि तेन न किमपि रुचिरं क्रियेत।

अपरं च पद्धतिपटवः शिक्षका अन्यूनत्वेन इत उत्तरमुपलभ्येरन्, यतः केवलं मोहमयीविभाग एवाधुना चत्वारोऽध्यापनमहाविद्यालयाः प्रतिष्ठापिताः सन्ति। एतेभ्यः प्रतिवत्सरं ये कृतविद्या भूत्वा बहिर्गच्छन्ति तेषु केचन लघुपत्तनस्थपाठशालास्वपि शिक्षकपदे नियुज्यन्ते। अतः पद्धतिपटुशिक्षकैरल्पशङ्का न पदं लभते। विधिस्त्वयं कार्यो यत्पद्धतिपटुभिः शिक्षकैरध्यापनमहाविद्यालयगतपद्धते रुचिरत्वं समवबुध्य साऽव्यभिचारेण मनसा स्वशालास्वनुसरणीया।

अनासादिताध्यापननैपुण्यैः सामान्यशिक्षकैरुपरिदर्शिता पद्धतिर्नानुसर्तुं शक्यत इत्यस्य पूर्वपक्षस्य प्रत्युत्तरमेतद्यत्सामान्यशिक्षकैरनुवादपद्धतिरनुविधेया। तथाप्यनिपुणैरिव निपुणैरपि शिक्षकैरेषैवानुवादपद्धतिरेकान्ततः

समाश्रयणीया, सा चैव नैसर्गिकीति चेत्कस्यापि दुराग्रहस्तर्हि तद्दृष्ट्या सर्वेऽप्यध्यापनमहाविद्यालया निष्प्रयोजनास्तेषु च शिक्षकाणामध्यापननैपुण्यसम्पादनोद्यमो निरर्थकश्च । एषा त्वविमृश्यकारिणामेव दृष्टिरित्यतो न सा मनागपि मनोयोगमर्हति । अनुवादपद्धतिस्तु नास्मद्दृशा तथा दोषभूयिष्ठा यथा संवादपद्धतिविषयेऽतिरिक्ताभिमानिभिर्गण्यते । व्याकरणप्रधानाया विश्लिष्टवाक्यानुवादपद्धत्याः संश्लिष्टपरिच्छेदानुवादपद्धतिर्वरमिति नो मतम्। अतः संश्लिष्टपरिच्छेदसमन्वितानि समीचीनानि संस्कृतपाठ्यपुस्तकान्यपेक्ष्यन्त इत्यपि नो भाति । सामान्यशिक्षकाणामनुवादपद्धतिसमाश्रयणं न दोषबहुलं, किन्तु तैर्यत्स्वयमेव वाचनपूर्वकमनुवादः क्रियते, छात्रैश्च केवलं श्रूयते तदनिष्टम् । सामान्यशिक्षकैर्वाङ्मयाध्यापनमधस्तनरीत्या कार्यम्—

प्रथमं तैः समुचितप्रस्तावानन्तरं मातृभाषया पाठसारं कथयित्वाध्याप्यमानः समग्रपाठः पाठांशो वा सन्धिविश्लेषणपूर्वकं सुस्पष्टं सकृद्वाचनीयः । तदनु शिक्षकेण च्छात्रैः साकं स एव पाठांशो सङ्घशो वाचनीयः। अनन्तरं छात्रैस्तस्यैव पाठांशस्य मनोगतवाचनं कार्यम् । मनोगतवाचनसमये शिक्षकेण कठिनपदार्थबोधने साहाय्यकारिणा भाव्यम् । छात्रैरपरिचितपदज्ञानानन्तरं स्वयमेव पाठार्थनिर्धारणे प्रयतितव्यमिति मनोगतवाचनप्रयोजनम् । अवसिते मनोगतवाचने प्रत्येकं छात्रेण वाक्यानि यथार्हमुच्चैर्वाचयित्वाऽनुवादप्रयत्नो विधेयः । अत्रापि शिक्षकेण च्छात्राणां क्लिष्टपदसंहतिबोधन एव साहाय्यं कर्तव्यं, न त्वन्यथा । अनुवादे छात्रसंविभाग एव समधिको भवतु, येन सर्वेऽपि शिष्याः सावधानाः स्थास्यन्ति । अनुवादमनु कैश्चिच्छात्रैः समग्रपाठांशः सुव्यक्तं वाचनीयो येन सर्वेषामपि वाचः शुद्धिर्भवेत्, सर्वे च वाचननिपुणाः सम्पद्येरन् । छात्रवाचनार्थमाङ्ग्लपाठशालासु न कदाप्यवकाशो दीयत इत्यसमञ्जसमेव । इयं वाङ्मयाध्यापनरीतिः सामान्यशिक्षकैरप्यनुसर्तुं शक्या स्यादिति भाति ; अन्यच्च वाङ्मयपरिचयपूर्वकमेव व्याकरणमध्याप्यमिति यद्भाषाभ्यासतत्त्वं तदपि सामान्यशिक्षकैर्व्यवहार्यतां नेतुं शक्येत ॥

—०—

वाङ्मयाध्यापनरीतिः।

वाङ्मयाध्यापने विश्लिष्टानि (त्रुटितानि) वाक्यान्युपक्रमावस्थायां नाध्यापनीयानि। यतस्त्रुटितवाक्येषु नैकाकिनमेव विषयं वस्तु वा पुरस्कृत्य सम्बद्धं वर्णनं कथनं वा क्रियते, येन च्छात्रचित्तानुरञ्जनं सम्पद्येत। अपि च त्रुटितवाक्यद्वारा व्याकरणमेवाध्याप्यते, न तु वाङ्मयं, व्याकरणाध्ययनार्थमेव त्रुटितवाक्यान्युदाह्रियन्त इति च्छात्रहृदयस्थः संस्कारः प्रमार्ष्टुं न शक्यते। अयं संस्कार उपक्रमावस्थायां 'संस्कृतभाषाध्ययनं क्लेशकरम्' इत्युद्वेगमुत्पादयति। अत उपक्रमपाठ्यपुस्तकेषु प्रतिपाठं विषयैकमधिकृत्य सुगमदुर्गमक्रमेण लेखनीयाः सङ्कलनीया वा कथासंवादवर्णनकाव्यात्मकाः संश्लिष्टपरिच्छेदाः, येषूत्तरोत्तरं गीर्वाणभाषागता विविधवाक्यभेदा विविधभावभेदाश्च सम्यगुपदर्शिता भवेयुः। विषयाः पुनर्ज्ञातपूर्वाश्छात्रमनोविनोदकाः प्राच्यसंस्कृतिबोधकाश्च स्युः। यथा—शरीरावयवाः, परिचितक्रियाः, परिचितवस्तूनि, परिचितप्राणिनः, परिचितदृश्यानि च। शरीरावयवानां परिचितक्रियासु वचनप्रतिवचनपूर्वं प्रदर्शितासु प्रारम्भ उपयुक्ततिङन्तानां पाठनं सुकरं भवति।

"वाङ्मयाध्यापने प्रायः कः कल्पोऽनुसर्तव्योऽध्यापकेन, कया दृष्ट्या च" इत्यन्यतमः प्रश्नो विद्यते मम संस्कृताध्यापनप्रश्नावल्यां, यस्य प्रत्युत्तरं क्वाचित्कत्वेन लब्धं मयाद्य यावत्। विरला एव ते जना ये साङ्गुलिनिर्देशं साक्षाद्वाङ्मयाध्यापनरीतिं वर्णयितुं पारयन्ति। अतः सम्यगवधारणार्थं मनोविज्ञानाधिष्ठितभाषातत्त्वावलम्बिनी प्राच्यसम्प्रदायानपायिनी च वाङ्मयाध्यापनरीतिः समासतोऽत्रोपस्थाप्यते।

१ प्रस्तावः [पदपरिचयः]—प्रस्तावे ज्ञातविषयेण सममज्ञातविषयः कुतूहलजननपूर्वकं संयुज्यते। विषये ज्ञातपूर्वे सत्यप्यधीयमाना भाषाऽत्राऽज्ञाता, यस्या ज्ञानमधिगन्तव्यम्। अत एवाऽऽदावध्याप्यमानपाठगतानामपरिचितपदानां परिचयो वस्तुचित्राभिनयादिदर्शनपूर्वकं सन्दर्भसमन्वयपुरस्सरं चाध्यापकेन कार्यः। प्रथममध्यापकेन प्रत्यक्षं वस्तु चित्रं वा प्रदर्श्य, तद्वाचकं पाठगतपदं समकालमेव सुस्पष्टमभिधाय, पदं फलके

स्थूलाक्षरैर्विलिख्य च तस्य परिस्फुटमुच्चारणं द्विस्त्रिर्वा छात्रमुखैः कारयितव्यम् । शब्दार्थज्ञापने विविधाः क्रियाः शरीरावयवैर्विधाय चित्रादिदर्शनद्वारा वस्तुसंस्थानगुणधर्मादिकं वर्णनीयं मुखेन । भाषाया घटकावयवो वाक्यं, न तु पदमित्यन्विताभिधानवादिना मतानुसारेणापरिचितपदानि वाक्येष्वनुस्यूतान्येवाध्याप्यानि, न तु विश्लिष्टत्वेन पाठनीयानि । यतः पदज्ञापने वृद्धव्यवहारस्य श्रेयस्त्वमभिमन्वाना अन्विताभिधानवादिनो वाक्यस्य संहतार्थग्रहणेनैव बालानां सम्यग्बोधो भवति, न पदमात्रश्रवणेनेति वदन्ति । तेषां रीतिमनुसृत्य भाषाया व्यवहार एव कार्यो मौखिकाध्यापने । विशेषतश्च बालच्छात्रैः संहतवाक्यश्रवणपूर्वकमेव पदान्यभ्यसनीयानि । यथा—

एषः वृक्षः (अस्ति) । एषा वृक्षस्य शाखा (अस्ति) । शाखायाम् एषः खगः । वृक्षे एतत् फलम् । फलं वर्णेन पीतम् (वर्णोऽत्र प्रत्यक्षं प्रदर्शनीयः) । खगः एतत् फलं भक्षयति (अभिनयदर्शनम्) । एवम् "गच्छ—आगच्छ, उत्तिष्ठ—उपविश, वाचय, वद" इति क्रियापदान्यभिनयद्वारैव पाठ्यन्ते ।

एतत्सर्वं गीर्वाणभाषयैव वक्तव्यम् । अनया रीत्या छात्रा मातृभाषोपयोगं विनापि पाठगतानपरिचितशब्दार्थान् सन्दर्भमात्रेण ज्ञातुं पारयन्ति । अत्र च्छात्रज्ञानेन्द्रियेषु प्राधान्येन त्रिविधः संस्कारो भवति, यथा—शब्दश्रवणे श्रुतिसंस्कारः, शब्दोच्चारणे वाक्संस्कारः, चित्रवर्णाभिनयादेर्लिखितशब्दस्य चावलोकने चक्षुःसंस्कारश्च । शब्दानां कण्ठस्थीकरणेऽयं त्रिविधः संस्कारः स्मृतिसाहचर्योत्पादनेनातीवोपकारको भवति । अध्यापकेन फलके लिखिता नूतनशब्दाश्छात्रैः स्वटिप्पणीपुस्तिकासु प्रतिलेख्याः । अत्र शोधपुरस्सरनिर्दोषलेखनार्थं छात्रहस्तेष्वपि संस्कारः कार्यः । अपरिचितभाषाध्यापने पाश्चात्यभाषातत्त्वविदां मतानुसारेण शब्दार्थज्ञापनं प्रायः (१) उपरितनरीत्या प्रत्यक्षदर्शनेन (व्यवहारेण), (२) मातृभाषानुवादेन, (३) लक्षणपर्यायादिकथनेन, (४) वाक्यगतसन्दर्भेण चेति चतुर्धा विधीयते । अत्रोत्तरोत्तरस्मात्पूर्वपूर्वः प्रकारः श्रेयान्, किन्तु बालाध्यापने प्रथम एव श्रेष्ठः ।

पदपरिचयसमये शिक्षकेण छात्रैः पदानां साङ्घिकमावर्तनं द्विस्त्रिर्वा कारयित्वा व्यक्तिशः शब्दोच्चारणं कारयितव्यं छात्रमुखैः । एत-

दसकृदावर्तनं वैदिकानां वेदपठनावर्तनस्य सुतरां सादृश्यं वहति, अग्रे च च्छात्राणां संशुद्धोच्चारणाय साधुवाचनाय च कल्पते। साङ्घिकावर्तने छात्रा अन्यच्छात्रसमागमेन स्वोच्चारणस्य युक्तायुक्तत्वं परीक्षितुं शक्नुवन्ति, विश्रम्भं च लभन्ते। अतः साङ्घिकावर्तनं वैयक्तिकोच्चारणात्पूर्वं कारयितव्यमध्यापकेनेति भाषाभ्यासतत्त्वम्। साङ्घिकावर्तने प्रथममध्यापकः सुविशदं शब्दमभिदधाति, तमनु च सर्वे छात्रा यौगपद्येन तमेव शब्दं वदन्ति। एतद् वृद्धव्यवहारानुकरणरूपं कर्म प्रतिसमयं द्विस्त्रिर्वा विधीयते।

२ वाचनम्। यं विषयमुद्दिश्य शब्दपरिचयावर्तनादिरूपं मौखिकमनुष्ठानं कृतं स एव विषयः पाठ्यपुस्तके लिखितरूपेण वर्तत इति निर्देष्टुं पाठ्यमानविभागो वाच्यतेऽधुना। अत्र वाचनात्पूर्वं मौखिकावर्तनं, लेखनात्पूर्वं वाचनं चेति भाषाभ्यासतत्त्वानुसारि पौर्वापर्यं समवधेयम्। अतोऽवसिते शब्दपरिचयादौ शिक्षको यथाप्रसङ्गं व्यक्तवर्णोच्चारलय–काकु–विरामादीनि सम्यग्वाचनतत्त्वान्याश्रित्य स्वयमेवोच्चैः समग्रमध्याप्यमानपाठं वाचयति। कदाचित्तु सङ्घशश्छात्रैः सार्धं वा वाचयति। साङ्घिके वाचने तु शिक्षक उपरिदर्शितपद्धत्या पूर्वमेकैकं वाक्यं वाचयति, पश्चाच्च च्छात्राः सङ्घशः शिक्षकमनु तत्तदेव वाक्यं वाचयन्ति। पाठगतभावानुगुणं लघुगुरूच्चारण–लय–काकु–विरामादियोजनेनैव समग्रपाठार्थो मातृभाषानुवादं विनापि च्छात्रैः सामान्यतोऽवगन्तुं शक्यते। सम्यग्वाचनमेवार्थावगमस्य गमकमित्यवबुद्ध्याध्यापकेन दृढानुशीलनपूर्वकं वाचननैपुण्यं सम्पादनीयम्। केचिद्विश्वविद्यालयोपाधिधारिणोऽप्यध्यापका गद्यपद्यात्मकान् संस्कृतपरिच्छेदान् समीचीनतया वाचयितुं नेशते, किमुत च्छात्राः। अत एव सनिर्बन्धमत्रोच्यते यत्प्राचीनसम्प्रदायिनां शास्त्रिप्रवराणां परिहासं परित्यज्याऽऽङ्ग्लोपाधिधारिभिर्गीर्वाणभाषाध्यापकैस्तेषां सुमनोहरा वाचनपद्धतिरनुकर्तव्येति।

३ वाचितभागमधिकृत्य प्रश्नाः। अनन्तरं पाठसन्दर्भानुसारेण शब्दार्थयोः समुचितसाहचर्यं छात्रमनःसु सुस्थिरं भवतु, वाक्यगतान्योन्यपदकारकज्ञानेन समग्रपाठः सुविज्ञातार्थो भवतु चेति हेतोः पाठमुद्दिश्याध्यापकेन यथाक्रमं खण्डान्वयपद्धत्या प्रश्नानुष्ठानं कार्यम्। श्रुतार्थग्रहण-

-सौकर्याय यथाऽन्विताभिधानवादिनां मतमनुसरणीयं तथा लिखितार्थ-ग्रहणसौकर्याय पदबोधपुरस्सरं वाक्यगतान्योन्यपदान्वयमवगच्छतामभिहि-तान्वयवादिनां मतमप्यत्र ग्राह्यम् । इत्थमभिहितान्वयान्विताभिधान-योः समुच्चय एव बालानां सुखबोधाय श्रुतलिखितभाषाध्यापने कार्यः । लिखि-तभाषागतवाक्यबोधाय वाक्यस्थान्योन्यपदानां साकाङ्क्षत्वमन्वयश्चेत्युभयं बोद्धव्यम् । अत एव वाक्यस्थपदानां खण्डशोऽन्वयः प्रश्नोत्तररीत्या क्रियते । इयं खण्डान्वयपद्धतिराकाङ्क्षायोग्यतासंनिधितत्त्वं पुरस्कृत्य प्राचीनभारतीयदार्शनिकैरेव समुद्भाविता, विस्तरेण चानुसृता काश्मीरक-वल्लभदेवविरचितायां शिशुपालवधटीकायां नारायणविरचितायां नैषधकाव्य-टीकायां च । मल्लिनाथकृताः पञ्चमहाकाव्यटीका दण्डान्वयपद्धत्यवलम्बिन्यः। दण्डान्वयात् खण्डान्वयो बालबुद्धिबोधनविषये प्रशस्यतरः, पाश्चा-त्यानां संवादपद्धतिरिवानुयोगप्रतिवचनात्मकः प्रकारो भाषाया दृढानुशीलनार्थमतीवोपयुक्तश्च । अतोऽयं टीकाग्रन्थनिविष्टः प्रश्नोत्तररूपः खण्डान्वयो मौखिकाध्यापनेऽध्यापकैर्विस्तरेणोपयो-जनीय इत्यस्मदभिप्रायः । खण्डान्वयपद्धत्यां प्रधानवाक्यगत क्रियापदं पुरस्कृत्यैव कर्तृकर्मपदानि विशेषणाद्यवशिष्टपदानि च प्रश्नद्वारा निष्का-स्यन्ते, सुबोधपर्यायैश्च व्याख्यायन्ते । अनेनैव क्रमेण समुचितप्रश्न-विधानपूर्वकमध्यापकैश्छात्रेभ्यः पुस्तकपाठगतपदान्याश्रित्य प्रत्युत्तराणि खण्डशो लब्धव्यानि । अध्यापकेन प्रश्नाः सर्वानेव छात्रानुद्दिश्य प्रष्टव्याः, न तु विशिष्टमेव छात्रमुद्दिश्य, येन सर्वेऽप्यतन्द्रिताः स्यास्यन्ति । अत्र छात्रैर्देयानि प्रतिवचनानि सम्पूर्णवाक्यरूपाण्येवापेक्षणी-यानि । यस्मिन्कस्मिन्नपि लघुपरिमाणे परिच्छेदे बहवः प्रश्नाः सम्भवन्ति । अतः परिच्छेदबोधनार्थमस्खलितोच्चारणार्थे च प्रारम्भिकाध्यापने प्रश्न-विधानप्राचुर्यमवलम्बनीयमध्यापकेन । प्राथमिकावस्थायां यावच्छक्यं पाठ-गतपदान्युपयुज्यैव प्रश्ना विरचनीयाः, येन छात्राः प्रायः पुस्तकस्थपदान्ये-वोपयुज्य प्रत्युत्तराणि दातुं प्रभवन्ति । उपक्रमावस्थायामनया पद्धत्या पाठ्यमानपरिच्छेदो मातृभाषोपयोगं विनापि सम्यगवगतार्थो भवति । प्रारम्भे छात्राः प्रश्नकाले पुस्तकमुद्घाट्यैव प्रतिभाषन्ताम्, पश्चाच्च प्रत्युत्तर-समये तेषां पुस्तकानि पिहितानि तिष्ठन्तु । एतत्प्रश्नोत्तरविधानं शुकपठन-

बदप्रबोधभूयिष्ठमिति न केनापि मन्तव्यम्, यतश्छात्रैः प्रबोधपूर्वकं "किं प्रश्नस्वरूपं, को विषयः प्रत्युत्तरे समावेश्यः, कथं च प्रत्युत्तरे पदवाक्यादिविन्यासः कार्यः" इति निपुणं विमृश्यैव प्रत्युत्तरं देयम्। एवं याते कियत्यपि काले प्रश्नप्रतिवचनानुष्ठानस्थितं पुस्तकगतभाषानुसरणं छात्रबोधानुसारेण शनैः शनैः परित्यक्तव्यम्। यस्मिन्कस्मिन्नपि वाक्ये कर्तृकर्मक्रियाविशेषणाव्ययवाचकाः प्रश्ना यथाशक्यं सम्भवन्ति। ते च किंकथम्भूतादीनि पदानि प्रयुज्य विरचनीयाः। यथा बालाध्यापनेऽधस्तनो गणेशवर्णनपरः प्रारम्भपाठो गृहीतः स्याच्चेत्तस्याध्यापनमधोलिखितरीत्या कार्यम्।

ॐ नमः श्रीगणेशाय।

"गणेशः गणानाम् ईशः। गणेशस्य पिता शिवः माता च गौरी। गणेशस्य मस्तकं सिन्दूरेण आरक्तम्। तस्मात् मस्तकात् सुगन्धिः मदः स्रवति। अतः एव लुब्धाः भ्रमराः तद् मस्तकं परितः भ्रमन्ति। गणेशः कर्णौ इतस्ततः चालयति भ्रमरान् च अपसारयति। गणेशस्य मस्तकं रत्नयुतेन किरीटेन चन्द्रस्य कलया च भूषितम्।

"तस्य द्वौ वामौ द्वौ दक्षिणौ च इति चत्वारः हस्ताः सन्ति। ते हस्ताः सुवर्णस्य वलयैः भूषिताः। गणेशः एकेन हस्तेन अङ्कुशं, द्वितीयेन कमलं, तृतीयेन च मोदकं वहति। चतुर्थं हस्तं सः अग्रे प्रसारयति, तेन च सः भक्तेभ्यः वरं यच्छति, 'सर्वेषां मङ्गलं भवतु' इति॥"

अस्मिन् प्रारम्भपाठे विसन्धिलेखनमनुसृत्य मातृभाषायां प्रचुरतयोपयुज्यमाना एव शब्दा बुद्ध्या प्रयुक्ताः। तेषां शब्दानां वाक्यगतसंस्कृतरूपपरिज्ञानमेवात्र प्रमुखं प्रयोजनम्। परमत्र "आरक्त, परितः, इतस्ततः, वाम–दक्षिण, वलयम्" इति पदानि, "स्रवति, भ्रमन्ति, चालयति, अपसारयति, प्रसारयति, वहति, यच्छति" इति प्रत्यक्षक्रियावाचकानि पदानि च छात्राणामपरिचितानि। एतान्यपरिचितपदानि वस्तुचित्रादिप्रदर्शनेन शरीराभिनयदर्शनेन च पाठारम्भे कथितपूर्वेण साङ्घिकावर्तनादिना क्रमशो ज्ञापयितुं शक्यन्ते। ततः परिच्छेदस्याध्यापककृतात्प्रकटवाचनादनन्तरमधस्तनरीत्या प्रश्नप्रतिवचनरूपो व्यवहारः प्रचालनीयः। प्रश्नानुष्ठानेऽप्यत्र चित्राद्युपयोगः कार्यः। छात्राणामपेक्षितोत्तराणि शिक्षकस्य

विशेषविधानं चार्धचन्द्रचिह्नद्वयेस्थापितानि। यद्यपि प्रश्नोत्तराण्यत्र लेखनसङ्क्षेपार्थं न सम्पूर्णतया लिखितानि, तथापि तानि च्छात्रेभ्यः सम्पूर्णवाक्यरूपेणैव निष्कासनीयानि।

प्रश्नोत्तराणि विवरणं च। (चित्रमुद्दिश्य) कः एषः? (एषः गणेशः)। एषः केषाम् ईशः? (एषः गणानाम् ईशः।—अत्र 'गण'—शब्दमुद्दिश्य मातृभाषायामध्यापकेन किमपि कथनीयम्)। कः गणेशस्य पिता? (शिवः)। का च माता? (गौरी)।—पार्वतीत्यप्यभिधानमध्यापकेन कथनीयम्। अत्र गणेशः पार्वतीपरमेश्वरयोः पुत्रत्वं कथं प्राप्त इति पौराणिकः सन्दर्भो मातृभाषया समासतः कथनीयः। अनन्तरमारक्तो वर्णश्छात्रैश्चित्रे दर्शयितव्यः। तदनन्तरं प्रश्नः)। गणेशस्य मस्तकं केन आरक्तम्? (सिन्दूरेण)। मदः स्रवति, कस्मात्? (तस्मात् मस्तकात्)। कीदृशः मदः स्रवति? (सुगन्धिः)। भ्रमराः भ्रमन्ति, कुत्र? (तद् मस्तकं परितः।—'परितः' इत्यत्र क्रियाभिनयः कार्यः)। कथम्भूताः भ्रमराः? (लुब्धाः)। भ्रमराः लुब्धाः, कुतः? ('मस्तकात् सुगन्धिः मदः स्रवति, अतः एव' इति सम्पूर्णं कारणनिर्देशकरं वाक्यं पुनश्छात्रैरुच्चारणीयम्)। गणेशः कर्णौ चालयति, कथम्? (इतस्ततः।—अभिनयदर्शनम्)। गणेशः अन्यच्च किं करोति? (अपसारयति।—अभिनयदर्शनम्)। सः कान् अपसारयति? (भ्रमरान्)। गणेशस्य मस्तकं भूषितं, केन? (किरीटेन)। किंविशिष्टेन किरीटेन भूषितम्? (रत्नयुतेन।—'रत्नैः युतेन युक्तेन सहितेन' इति विग्रहपुरःसरं सुबोधपर्यायः कथनीयः)। पुनश्च तद् मस्तकं भूषितं, कया? (चन्द्रस्य कलया। चन्द्रकलाया आकारस्य रुचिरत्वं,किरणानां सुखशीतलत्वं चोद्दिश्य च्छात्राणां परिचितानुभवो मातृभाषायां छात्रेभ्यः प्रश्नपूर्वकं निष्कासनीयः)। गणेशस्य कति हस्ताः सन्ति? (चत्वारः। छात्रैरत्र 'एकः द्वौ त्रयः चत्वारः' इति रीत्या हस्ताः गणनीयाः)। चत्वारः हस्ताः कथं तिष्ठन्ति? (द्वौ वामौ द्वौ दक्षिणौ च इति)। हस्ताः भूषिताः, कैः? (सुवर्णस्य वलयैः।—चित्रे छात्रैर्वलयानि प्रदर्शयितव्यानि)। (चित्रमुद्दिश्य) गणेशः एतेन हस्तेन वहति, कम्? (अङ्कुशम्)। सः कमलं वहति, केन

हस्तेन ? (द्वितीयेन हस्तेन)। सः मोदकं वहति, केन हस्तेन ? (तृतीयेन)। सः अग्रे प्रसारयति (अभिनयदर्शनम्) कम् ? (चतुर्थं हस्तम्)। तेन सः किं करोति ? (वरं यच्छति)। स वरं यच्छति (अभिनयदर्शनम्) केभ्यः। (भक्तेभ्यः)। कः सः वरः ? ('सर्वेषां मङ्गलं भवतु' इति।–अन्तिमं समग्रं वाक्यं छात्रैर्मातृभाषायामनुवदितव्यम्। इत्थं विशिष्टवाक्यानां दुर्बोधवाक्यानां च मातृभाषयानुवादश्छात्रावबोधपरीक्षार्थं मध्ये मध्ये समाश्रयणीयः)।

स्थालीपुलाकन्यायेन बालाध्यापने खण्डान्वयपद्धतेरुपयोजनमुपरि दर्शितम्। अत्राध्यापकेन न केवलं प्रश्नाः प्रष्टव्याः, अपि तु वाक्यगतदुरूहपदसंहतीनां सरलसुबोधसंस्कृतेनैव यावच्छक्यमर्थो विशदीकर्तव्यः। खण्डान्वयावलम्बिटीकाकृतामर्थविवृतौ यथा समासविग्रहः सुबोधपर्यायकथनममरादिकोशपङ्क्तिप्रस्तावो वाग्विशेषविवरणं तात्पर्यकथनं पौराणिकसन्दर्भकथनमित्यादयो विविधप्रकारा उपयुज्यन्ते तथैव क्रमोऽध्यापकेन मौखिकाध्यापने समवलम्बनीयः। अनया परिपाट्या वाक्यस्थान्योन्यपदानां कारकमर्थश्च सम्यक्तया छात्रैरवगम्येते। केषाञ्चिद्वाक्यरचनाविशेषाणां स्थूणानिखननन्यायेन दृढीकरणाय तत्तद्रचनाविशिष्टानि वाक्यान्तराण्युदाहृत्य तत्सदृशानां मातृभाषास्थवाक्यानां संस्कृतेऽनुवादश्छात्रैः कारयितव्यः। कदाचिदनेकवाक्यतात्पर्यबोधका एकवाक्यतासूचका व्यापकप्रश्ना विशेषतश्छात्राणां प्रौढावस्थायां प्रष्टव्याः। प्रौढच्छात्राणां पञ्चमहाकाव्याध्यापनेऽपीयमेव रीतिः प्रश्नपरिमाणं लघूकृत्य खण्डान्वयिटीकाग्रन्थानुसारेणोपयोज्या। अध्यापकेन प्रश्नाश्छात्रदृष्टिमग्रे निधाय सोल्लासं सकौशलं च प्रष्टव्याः। अध्यापने सर्वदैवाध्यापकमनोवृत्त्या तथा सोल्लासया भाव्यं, यथा सैव च्छात्रेष्वपि सङ्क्रम्य तेषामध्याप्यविषये कुतूहलमनुरागं चोत्पादयेत्। यद्यप्यध्यापने प्रश्नप्रतिवचनार्थविवृतिकर्मणि संस्कृतमेव प्रयोक्तव्यं, तथापि वाग्विशेषज्ञापनार्थं पौराणिकसन्दर्भकथनार्थं परिचितानुभवनिवेदनार्थं दुरूहकल्पनाविशदीकरणार्थं च मातृभाषापि प्रसङ्गवशेन च्छात्रबोधसौकर्याय प्रयोज्या। प्रश्ना वैविध्यपूर्णाः सुतर्कानुसारिणश्चापेक्ष्यन्ते। समुचितप्रत्युत्तराणि कैश्चिच्छात्रैः क्रमशः पुनरुच्चारणीयानि।

एवं वैयक्तिकवाक्यानां पर्याप्तं मौखिकावर्तनं भाषासंस्कारदृढत्वाय समग्रपरिच्छेदस्य साधुवाचनाय च कल्पते।

४ पुनर्वाचनम्। प्रश्नोत्तरसहकृतेऽर्थविशदीकरणे समाप्तेऽधिगतज्ञानस्य सङ्कलनाय च्छात्रचेतःसु स्थिरीकरणाय चाध्यापकेन पुनर्यथापूर्वमेवाधीतभागो वाचनीयः। आवश्यकं चेदध्यापकेन च्छात्रैः साकं पुनरपि साङ्घिकवाचनं कार्यम्। तदनन्तरं प्रत्येकं छात्रेण सकलाध्येतॄणां पुरत आगत्य समधीतपाठांशः सुस्पष्टं वाचनीयः। अत्रान्यच्छात्रैर्वाचनप्रमादपरिमार्जनं कर्तव्यं साधूच्चारणाभ्यासाय। पाठस्य मुहुर्मुहुरुच्चैर्वाचनं यावन्मात्रं विद्यार्थिभिः क्रियेत तावन्मात्रं तैर्भाषाऽवबोधपूर्वं स्वायत्तीकृता स्यात्। अपि च गीर्वाणवाण्याः श्रुतिसुखदं पदलालित्यमर्थगौरवं व्यञ्जकत्वं च तदैव प्रतीयन्ते यदाऽस्खलितव्यक्तवर्णोच्चारयुतं प्रोच्चैर्वाचनमारभ्यते। अतश्छात्रैर्मुक्तकण्ठवाचनाभ्यासो यथाक्रमं परिवर्धितव्य इत्यत्र विषये सविशेषोद्यमोऽध्यापकैरनुष्ठेयः।

५ संयोजनम्। अधिगतज्ञानस्य ध्रुवत्वापादनाय तस्यान्यस्मिन् व्यतिकरे संयोजनमपि विधीयते। तदर्थं पाठगतभाषाविशेषानवलम्ब्य च्छात्राभ्यासार्थं गद्यसमस्यापूरणात्मका अन्ये च भाषाव्यवसायाः (Language Exercises) उपकल्प्यन्ते, ये नात्र सङ्क्षेपेणापि वर्णयितुं पार्यन्ते।

इयमेव सामान्यतो वाङ्मयाध्यापनस्य रीतिः। अत्र संवादपद्धतिः कथनपद्धतिरनुवादपद्धतिश्चेत्येताः सकला अपि यथाप्रसङ्गं यथास्थलं च कथं प्रयुज्यन्ते तथाऽन्विताभिधानाभिहितान्वयसमुच्चयपूर्वकं खण्डान्वयपद्धतिः कथमवलम्ब्यत इति सम्यग्दृष्टं स्यात्। सृष्टिवर्णनाध्यापनमिव कथासंवादकाव्याद्यध्यापनमपि प्रागुक्तरीत्यैव विधातव्यम्। तत्तद्विषये भेदास्तावदत्र उपस्थाप्यन्ते—

कथाध्यापनम्। १ कथाध्यापनेऽपि समुचितविषयप्रस्तावरूपेण कथान्तर्गतापरिचितपदानां परिचयः कार्यः। २ पश्चादध्येष्यमाणा समग्रकथा गुरुणा साभिनयं काकुविरामपुरस्सरं च गैर्वाण्यां कथनीया। एतादृशं कथाकथनं वाचनमात्रात्सुतरां परिणामावहम्। ३ अनन्तरं श्रवणमात्रेणैव

च्छात्रैः कथा कियदंशेनावगतेत्याकलयितुं शिक्षकेण कथायाः पिण्डितार्थमुद्दिश्य त्रिचतुराः स्थूलप्रश्नाः प्रष्टव्याः। ४ तदनु पुस्तकस्था सैव कथा कथांशो वा सूक्ष्माध्ययनार्थमुपरिवर्णितरीत्या वाचनीयः शिक्षकेण। ५ अवशिष्टं सूक्ष्मप्रश्नविवरणादिकं तु पूर्वोक्तरीत्यैव विधेयम्।

नाट्यसंवादाध्यापनम्। (१) अपरिचितशब्दपरिचयरूपेण च्छात्रानुभवाश्रयिप्रश्नप्रतिवचनरूपेण वा प्रस्तावः कार्यः मातृभाषायां संस्कृते वा। (२) शिक्षककृतं परिणामावहमभिनययुक्तं च द्विर्वाचनम्। प्रथमवाचनसमये छात्रैः स्वीयपुस्तकान्यनुद्घाट्यैव केवलं श्रोतव्यम्। (३) प्रश्नविवरणानुवादादिविधानं संवादगतरचनाविशेषाणां सोदाहरणमध्यापनं च। (४) साङ्घिकं वाचनम्। (५) छात्रविहितं साभिनयं संवादवाचनम्। नाटकस्थाः संवादाः प्राय एवमेवाध्यापनीयाः।



काव्याध्यापनम्।

सम्प्रतितनं काव्याध्ययनम्।

आङ्ग्लपाठशालासु भूयान् कालस्तिङन्तरूपसाधनिकायामन्येषां निष्प्रयोजनव्याकरणविभागानामध्यापने शुकवत्पटने च व्यतीयते। वर्षचतुष्टयपरिमित आङ्ग्लपाठशालागतसंस्कृताध्ययने प्रायो वर्षत्रयं यावत् प्राधान्येन व्याकरणाध्ययनं व्याकरणोदाहरणपराणां त्रुटितवाक्यानामाङ्ग्लानुवादश्चेति परिपाटी पूर्वं प्रचलिताऽऽसीत्। वाङ्मयाध्ययनं प्रास्तूयत तृतीये वर्षे, यदा पञ्चतन्त्रहितोपदेशादिगद्यग्रन्थानां केचिदंशा रघुवंशसदृशकाव्यग्रन्थानां कश्चित्सर्गश्चेति वाङ्मयमध्येतव्यमासीत्। प्रारम्भे कानिचित्सुभाषितान्यप्यध्याप्यन्त, किन्तु तानि प्रायो नीत्युपदेशमात्रपराणि, न तु रसभावोद्बोधकानि। आङ्ग्लपाठशालागतस्यैतद्वाङ्मयाध्ययनस्यापर्याप्तत्वादध्येतारः पूर्वं बहिः

पाठशालायाः केषाञ्चिच्छात्रिणां सविधे वाङ्मयाध्ययननिरता अभवन् । अतः पूर्वतनाध्येतॄणां संस्कृतनैपुण्यसिद्धावाङ्ग्लपाठशालीयाध्यापनपद्धतेरल्पीयानेवांश इति सुविज्ञातं भवेत् । इदानीमियं परिपाटी किञ्चित्परिवर्तनमापन्ना विद्यते । यथा–आङ्ग्लभाषामाध्यमं विहाय मातृभाषामाध्यमं संस्कृताध्ययने प्रयुज्यते, त्रुटितवाक्यस्थले च प्ररोचककथासुभाषितप्रस्तावो बहुशः प्रारम्भत एव क्रियते । किन्तु वाङ्मयाध्ययनापेक्षया व्याकरणाध्यापन एव गरीयानाग्रहो विद्यतेऽद्याप्यदूरदृष्टीनामध्यापकानाम् । वाङ्मयबोधाय यद् व्याकरणज्ञानमनिवार्यं तस्मादप्यधिके निष्प्रयोजनव्याकरणपाठनेऽद्यापि कालयापनं विधीयते । एतत्परिपाटीफलं त्विदं यन्निष्प्रयोजनव्याकरणपठनगुरुभाराद्, वाङ्मयबोधायातिमात्रमपेक्षितं परिमितव्याकरणज्ञानमपि न स्थिरीभवति च्छात्रचेतःसु । एतावानाङ्ग्लपाठशालाध्यापकानां समादरः संस्कृतवाङ्मयाध्यापने,किमुत रसविभूतिपूर्णे काव्याध्यापने । गीर्वाणभाषाया निसर्गमाधुर्यमर्थगौरवं विविधरसभावसम्प्लुतत्वं च कदा ज्ञातव्यान्यध्येतृभिस्तेषां संस्कृताध्ययने वा कदा रुचिः सञ्जनितव्या, यदा तेषां भूरिकालं यावद्वाङ्मयेऽनधिगम्यमानाना व्याकरणरूपाणामेव पाठनं प्रचलेत् । अतो वाङ्मयबोधोपकारि तिङन्तस्थूलज्ञानसहितं सुबन्तकारकसमासतद्धित-कृदन्तादि परिमितं व्याकरणं छात्रबुद्धौ स्थिरीकृत्यानतिक्रान्त एव काले प्रथमं गद्यवाङ्मयाध्ययनं तदुत्तरं च काव्याध्ययनमारब्धव्यम् । सम्प्रति यदल्पीयः काव्यपाठनमाङ्ग्लपाठशालासु भवति तस्मिन्नपि रसग्रहणापेक्षया भाषावबोधमात्रदृष्टिरेवाधिकतरं पुरस्क्रियते ।

सूक्ष्मव्याकरणज्ञानाधिगमस्य परिणते वयस्येव सुशकत्वादाङ्ग्लमहाविद्यालयेष्वेव लघु–मध्य–कौमुद्यादिद्वारा व्याकरणाध्ययनं पाठ्यक्रमे संनिवेशमर्हति । किन्तु तत्र व्याकरणाधीतेरत्यन्ताभावे काव्यनाटकादिवाङ्मयमात्राध्ययनं प्रवर्तते । आङ्ग्लमहाविद्यालयेषु तु सर्वत्राप्याङ्ग्लभाषामाध्यममेव संस्कृताध्यापने प्रयुज्यते, येन परिणतबुद्धीनामप्यध्येतॄणां संस्कृतटीकावाचनापेक्षयाऽऽङ्ग्लानुवाद एव भूयसी रतिरिति नैसर्गिकमेव । अत्र तु लाभोऽयं यदाङ्ग्लभाषागतानां काव्यसमीक्षाशास्त्रग्रन्थानामध्ययनेन भावसङ्कलनप्रधानाया (Synthetic) दृष्टेर्व्यापकत्वं वैशद्यं च च्छात्रैरधिगम्येते, ययोरुपयोजनं संस्कृतकाव्याध्ययनेऽपि विधातुं शक्यते । हानि-

स्त्वेषां यदधीतिनां संस्कृतभाषाज्ञानं स्तोकमात्रमवशिष्यते, तेषां पल्लवग्राहिपाण्डित्ये रुचिर्वर्धते च ।

प्रयोजनम् ।

काव्याध्यापने न केवलं पदकारकज्ञानं पर्याप्तम् । पदकारकज्ञानेन तात्पर्यार्थावगतिः सम्यग्वाच्यार्थबोधो वा गद्यस्यैव प्रयोजनम् । अतो विपुलगद्याध्ययनानन्तरं काव्याध्ययनं महते हिताय कल्पेत । 'वाक्यं रसात्मकं काव्यम्' इति काव्यलक्षणमधिकृत्य न केवलं तात्पर्यार्थावगमो वाच्यार्थबोधो वा, अपि तु व्यङ्ग्यार्थसूचनं नवरसाभिव्यञ्जनं चोभाभ्यामपि "सद्यःपरनिर्वृतिः" इत्येव काव्याध्ययनाध्यापनयोः प्रमुखं प्रयोजनम् । या कल्पनाशक्तिर्मनुजमात्रेऽन्तर्हिता कविजने चोद्रेकेणाभिव्यक्ता तस्याः कविवचोभिरेवोद्बोधनं, नवनवोन्मेषशालिन्या प्रतिभया प्रसादास्पदीकृतस्य कविविहङ्गमस्य भावसङ्कल्पपक्षावारुह्यालोकप्रभाभासुरेऽन्तरिक्षे सञ्चारः,—यथा, सीतारामाभ्यां सह व्योमयानमध्यास्योदधिमेखलालङ्कृतां लङ्कां परित्यज्यायोध्यानगरी गन्तव्या, रामगिर्याश्रमान्मेघदूतेन सह वा विहायसि सञ्चर्य यक्षेश्वराणां वसतिरलका गन्तव्या च विविधान् चित्तचक्षुर्दृश्यानालोकानवलोकयद्भी रसज्ञजनैरिति सकलमौलिभूतं प्रयोजनं काव्यस्य । काव्यस्य नीत्युपदेशपरं प्रयोजनं यद्यप्युररीकृतं मम्मटेन, तथापि तत् 'कान्तासम्मिततया' एव, न तु प्राधान्येनेति समवबुध्य काव्याध्यापने रसाभिव्यञ्जनपरैः सद्यःपरनिर्वृतौ चैकाग्रदृष्टिभिः काव्याध्यापकैर्भाव्यम् ।

पद्यकाव्ययोर्भेदः ।

अत एव मर्मज्ञैः संस्कृतसाहित्यमीमांसकैः काव्यशब्दो रसदृष्टिं पुरस्कृत्यैव प्रयुज्यते । तद्दृष्ट्या गद्यं पद्यं चेत्युभेऽपि रसप्राधान्यात्काव्यकोटिमधिरोहतः, न केवलं पद्यमेव काव्यव्यवच्छेदकम् । पद्यतुन्दिलेऽपि संस्कृतवाङ्मये तत्त्वचिन्तापरा वाच्यार्थकथनबहुला अहवरछन्दोबद्धा ग्रन्था रसवैकल्यात्काव्यपदवीं नार्हन्तीति पूर्वतनसाहित्यविदामेव सिद्धान्तः । अन्यथा प्राक्तने काले बाणभट्टकृतौ कादम्बरीहर्षचरितग्रन्थौ, दण्डिनो दशकुमारचरितं, सुबन्धोर्वासवदत्ता चार्वाचीने कालेऽम्बिकादत्तव्यासविरचितः

शिवराजविजय इत्येते ग्रन्था गद्यवसनं परिदधाना अपि भूयःपरिमाणेन काव्यरससम्भृताः कथं भवेयुः ?।

कीदृशानि काव्यान्यध्यापनीयानि ।

नीत्युपदेशः काव्याध्ययनस्य गौणं प्रयोजनमिति विज्ञाय नीत्युपदेशप्रधानानि सुभाषितानि नादावध्यापनीयानि । नीत्युपदेशपराणि सुभाषितान्येव काव्यमित्यन्यथाग्रहः परिवर्जनीयो मम्मटमतानुसारेण । सुभाषितरत्नभाण्डागारस्थानि पशुखगाद्यन्योक्तिपराणि, 'उष्ट्राणां च गृहे लग्नम्' इति परिहासविनोदपूर्णानि, सुपुत्रकुपुत्रादिविषयैकावलम्बीनि हृद्योपमादृष्टान्तादिभिः प्रपूरितानि सुबोधसुभाषितान्येव प्रारम्भ अध्ययनार्हाणि । तदनन्तरं रघुकुमारकिरातादिपञ्चमहाकाव्याध्ययनात्प्राक् तेभ्योऽपि सुगमतराणि नैसर्गिककवित्वेनोद्भासमानानि, अपाणिनीयप्रयोगबाहुल्याच्छास्त्रिभिर्गजनिमीलिकया दृश्यमानान्यपि प्रथितयशसां महाकवीनां स्फूर्तिप्रदानि रामायणमहाभारतगतानि विविधरसपरिप्लुतप्रसङ्गवर्णनानि विभिन्नर्तुमनोहरदृश्यवर्णनानि चादावेवाभ्यासमर्हन्ति । किन्तु रामायणमहाभारतस्था वृत्तान्तकथनमात्रपराश्छन्दोरूपेणावतीर्णा अपि काव्यरसवैरल्याद् गद्यसदृशा विभागा नानुशीलनयोग्याः । पञ्चज्ञानेन्द्रियग्राह्यदृश्यानां वर्णनेन सुमनोहरकल्पनाभिश्च चित्तचक्षुर्ग्राह्यां दृश्यमालामुत्पादयतां, कल्पनाप्रतिबोधजननेनान्यादृशमालोकं प्रदर्शयतां, स्थूलसृष्टिं विस्मारयतामेव काव्यानामभ्यासः श्रेयान् ।

अध्यापनाधिकारः ।

न केवलमरसिकत्वेऽपि परीक्षोत्तरणार्थमेव साहित्यशास्त्राध्ययनं शुष्ककाष्ठभेदनमिवानुतिष्ठन्तः काव्याध्यापनेऽधिकारिणः। नैसर्गिकसहृदयत्वेन जीविते सृष्टौ च प्रतिप्रसङ्गं प्रतिस्थलं काव्यं पश्यन्तस्तद्रसं चाकण्ठं निपीयाऽऽनन्दस्य परां कोटिं गच्छन्तः, सात्त्विकभावैस्तं बहिरनुभावयन्तः, काव्यं जीवितपयोनिधिमथितं नवनीतमेवेत्याकलय्य ग्रन्थगतेऽपि काव्यरसेऽतुलां निर्वृतिमनुभवन्तः, काव्यरसाभिव्यञ्जने साहित्यशास्त्रं साधनमात्रमिति याथार्थ्यमवबुद्ध्य सहृदयतया तच्छास्त्राध्ययननिरता एव जनाः काव्याध्यापनेऽधिकारिणः । अन्येषामध्यापनं वाच्यार्थमात्रबोधनाय शुष्कपर्यालोचनाय कल्पेत, न तु रसोत्कर्षाय ।

प्रस्तावः। छात्राणां परिचितानुभवमधिष्ठाय तत्कल्पनाशक्तिप्रतिबोधजनकैः प्रश्नैः प्रस्तावः कार्यः। शक्यं चेत्प्रस्तूयमानविषयसन्दर्भानुसारेणैवाध्येष्यमाणकाव्यगतानां केषाञ्चिदपरिचितपदानामर्थः सुबोधपर्यायैर्विशदीकर्तव्यः। छात्रैर्ज्ञातपूर्वाणां विशिष्टपर्यायाणां तेभ्यो निष्कासनादनन्तरमेव तत्समानार्थानि श्लोकस्थितान्यपरिचितपदानि तैः पर्यायैः संयोज्य प्रवक्तव्यानि फलके लेखनीयानि चेत्ययमत्र क्रमः। किन्तु नूतनपदपरिचयकाले न कथमपि काव्यकेन्द्रवर्तिनी कल्पना सूचनीया। अन्यथा प्रस्तावपदस्य यौगिकोऽर्थः परिवर्तेत। प्रौढावस्थायां साङ्घिकावर्तनं चित्रोपयोगो वा नापेक्ष्यते। चित्रोपयोगः काव्यशब्दैरुत्पद्यमाने जडचित्रातिशायिनि मनश्चित्रे व्याघातं जनयति। तस्माच्चित्रोपयोगः प्रौढावस्थायां विशेषतः काव्याध्यापने परिवर्जनीयः।

वाचनम्। समुचितप्रस्तावानन्तरं पाठ्यमानकाव्यांशस्य सन्दर्भप्रसङ्गादिकथनमुखेन लय-स्वरसङ्क्रम-विरामादियोजनया भावानुगुणं विशदं वाचनं, यथाशक्यं सुस्वरं चाध्यापकेन कर्तव्यम्। शास्त्रिप्रवराणां हरिकीर्तनकराणां पुराणप्रवक्तॄणां च श्रुतिमनोहरा श्लोकपठनपद्धतिरत्र ग्राह्या। पुस्तकमाश्रित्य काव्यवाचनमित्ययं सम्प्रतितनानामध्यापकानां निकृष्टः पन्थाः। अध्याप्यमानं काव्यं कण्ठस्थं चेत्तत्पठनं सविशेषं परिणामावहं भवति। प्राचीनसम्प्रदायिनः शास्त्रिवरेण्या विपुलपद्यपङ्क्तीनां कण्ठगतत्वान्मुखपठनमात्रेणापि काव्याध्यापनेऽलङ्कर्मीणाः। अत एव तेषां पठनं ग्रन्थबन्धनं समुत्सार्य लय-काकु-विरामादिभिरनिर्बन्धं रसभावाभिव्यञ्जकं भवति। अधुनातनाध्यापकैरपीयमेव सरणिरनुसर्तव्या। वाचनं पठनं वा यथावश्यं द्विस्त्रिर्वा कार्यम्। तत्परिणामावहं चेदसंशयं काव्यस्थूलार्थप्रतीतिं जनयति।

अध्यापकस्य सुमनोहरा वाचनपद्धतिरविवादं छात्राणामनुकरणबुद्धिं प्रबोध्य तानपि सम्यग्वाचनपटून् विदधाति। अतः काव्याध्यापनात्प्रागध्यापकेन गृहे स्वयं काव्यवाचनाभ्यासः कार्यः। समग्रकाव्यांशपठनं सामान्यतोऽर्थप्रतीतिकारिण्या गत्या समं लयसमन्वितं भवतु, येन काव्यांशश्छात्रैरधिगतार्थः स्यात्। काव्यगतः स्थायिभावो व्यभिचारिभावसनाथो

घोपकारिणा '[1]अर्पणाख्य'–नाद्‌धर्मेण कथं प्रकाशनीयः, पाठ्यमानकाव्ये विशिष्टपदवाक्यांशाश्छात्रसमवधानजननार्थे कथं [2]विसर्गपुरस्सरं (वर्णाघात-पूर्वकं) सुविशदमुच्चारणीयाः, काव्यपङ्क्ताविसमाप्तायामप्यर्थावसानानुसारेण मध्येऽपि कथं [3]विरामानुबन्धौ प्रदर्शनीयौ, विविधभावानुगुणं कण्ठे कथं [4]दीपनप्रशमने सम्पादनीये, भावपरिवर्तनानुरोधेन कथं स्वरेण काकुर-भिव्यङ्क्तव्या, उच्चदीप्तमन्द्रनीचद्रुतविलम्बितादयः पाठ्यालङ्काराः समु-चितसंयोजनेन भावव्यक्तये कथमुपयोजनीया इत्यादि कृत्स्नमपि भारतीय-नाट्यशास्त्रगतपाठ्यधर्मानुरोधेन पूर्वे सम्यग्विमृश्यैव प्रकटपठनाभ्यासोऽ-ध्यापकेन गृहे कार्यः, काव्याध्यापनकाले छात्राणा पुरतः सकलं च तदा-विष्करणीयं, येन तेषां काव्यस्थूलार्थप्रतीतिः स्यात्, काव्यवृत्तचारुता यमकानुप्रासादिशब्दालङ्काराश्च च्छात्रहृदयरञ्जकाः स्युः।

स्थूलप्रश्नाः। छात्राणां काव्यस्थूलार्थप्रतीतिं परीक्षितुं द्वित्राः प्रश्नाः प्रष्टव्याः, यैर्विविक्तश्लोकसूचितः समग्रकाव्यगतो मुख्याभिप्रायोऽभिव्यक्तः स्यात्, व्यभिचारिभावसहकृत एकत्वपर्यवसायी स्थायिभावश्छात्रचित्तेषु सुस्थिरश्च भवेत्। मुख्याभिप्रायपरिज्ञानमेवाध्येतॄन् काव्यस्य सूक्ष्माध्ययने प्रवर्तयति।

सूक्ष्माध्ययनम्। सूक्ष्माध्ययनार्थं खण्डान्वयपद्धत्या रसभावपूर्णे-नान्तःकरणेन प्रश्नविवरणादिकमध्यापकेन प्रचालनीयम्। 'रमणीयार्थप्रति-पादकः शब्दः काव्यम्' इति पण्डितराजजगन्नाथोक्त्यनुसारं रमणीयार्थे

---

१ अर्पणं नाम लीलावर्णस्वरेणापूरयदिव रङ्गं यत्पठ्यते (भा. नाट्यशास्त्रम्)।

२ विसर्गो नाम वाक्यन्यासः (भा. नाट्यशास्त्रम्)।

३ अर्थसमाप्तौ कार्यवशात्र च्छन्दोवशाद् दृश्यन्ते हि एकद्वित्रिचतुरक्षरा विरामाः, 'पदवर्णसमासे च'। "समीक्ष्य वृत्ते कर्तव्यो विरामो रसभावतः। ते विरामाः स्मृताः काव्ये वृत्तपादसमुद्भवाः॥ उत्क्रम्यापि क्रमं तज्ज्ञैः कार्यास्तेऽर्थवशात्तदा॥ अनुबन्धः पदान्तरेष्वविच्छेदानुच्छ्वासनम्॥

४ दीपनं नाम त्रिस्थानशोभि वर्धमानस्वरञ्च। प्रशमनं नाम तारं गतानां स्वराणामवैस्वर्येणावतरणमिति॥ (भा. ना. शास्त्रम्)

व्यङ्ग्यार्थं वा प्रतिपादयितुमर्थानुसारिणः शब्दाः कथं काव्ये प्रयुक्ता इति शब्दार्थोभयदृष्टिमाश्रित्य छात्राणां कल्पनाशक्तिं प्रस्फोरयन्तो रसभावोद्बोधकाः प्रश्ना विरचनीयाः, न पदकारकबोधमात्रपराः। काव्यरसग्रहणं पदकारकबोधमवलम्बत एव, किन्तु विपुलवाङ्मयाध्ययनेन छात्रहृदयेषु परिपाकं प्राप्त एव कारकज्ञाने काव्याध्ययननारम्भणीयम्। अस्मिन्नवसरेऽपेक्षितमपि तज्ज्ञानं काव्यरसग्रहणापेक्षया गौणत्वं भजते। कारकबोधः काव्याध्ययने रसभावकल्पनादिकमग्रे प्रस्थाप्यैव स्वयं साधनभूतः सन् कृतार्थीभवति। अतः प्रश्नविवरणादिकं प्राधान्येन रसभावकल्पनाभिव्यञ्जकं यया परिपाट्या भवेत्तैव काव्याध्यापनेऽङ्गीकर्तव्या।

शास्त्रिवरेण्यानां काव्याध्यापनशैली प्रायो रसोद्वाहिनी, यतस्तेषां प्रगाढवाङ्मयाध्ययनं मनःसमाधिमाधायोन्नताभिरुचिमुत्पाद्य च तांस्तादात्म्योत्साहसम्पन्नानिवाध्यापनकर्मणि नियोजयति। विपुलवाङ्मयास्वादजनितमध्यापकगतं तादात्म्यमध्येतृष्वपि प्रतिफलितं भूत्वा तेषां वाङ्मयाभिरुचिं संवर्धयति। लोकशास्त्रकाव्याद्यवेक्षणाल्लब्धा निपुणता काव्यज्ञशिक्षयाऽभ्यासश्च शक्तिसहकृतौ यथा कवेः काव्योद्भवे तथा व्याख्यातुरपि सरसव्याख्यानकौशले हेतुः। 'क्रियासिद्धिः सत्त्वे भवति महतां नोपकरणे' इत्युक्त्यनुसारेण रसविदो व्याख्यातुर्माहात्म्यमेवात्र हेतुः, रीतिरकिञ्चित्करेति यद्यपि सत्यं,तथाप्यावेदनरीतिज्ञानं प्रज्ञावतोऽध्यापकस्योपोद्बलकं,न तु हानिकरमिति—

> शिष्टा क्रिया कस्यचिदात्मसंस्था सङ्क्रान्तिरन्यस्य विशेषयुक्ता।
> यस्योभयं साधु स शिक्षकाणां धुरि प्रतिष्ठापयितव्य एव॥

इत्येतस्मात्कालिदासवचनात्सिध्यति। पूर्वतनानां शास्त्रिवराणां विततं ज्ञानं संस्कृतिसूचकानां विविधपौराणिकसन्दर्भाणां प्रपूरणे पर्याप्तम्। मनोविनोदनपराणां कथादृष्टान्तादीनां प्रकृष्टावगाहनवशात्तेषां काव्यविवरणोपयुक्तं कथनकौशलमपि छात्रान्मन्त्रमुग्धानिव चित्रविन्यस्तानिव करोति। अतस्तेषां काव्यपाठनमतितरां निर्वृतिमादधदध्येतृहृदयेषु स्मृतिसाहचर्योत्पादनेन चिरसंस्कारकरं भवति। आधुनिकमनोविज्ञानानवगतावपि ते मनोविज्ञानाधिष्ठितान्येवाध्यापनतत्त्वान्यबोधपूर्वमेव केषुचित्स्थलेषु परिपालयन्तीत्यत्र विषये प्रत्यक्षविद एव प्रमाणम्।

किन्तु तेषामध्यापनमिदानीन्तने काले कथनैकपरिपाटीमेवावलम्बते, न तु प्रश्नोत्तरपरिपाटीम् । तैः कथनप्रधानां दण्डान्वयपद्धतिं हित्वाऽऽधुनिकसंवादपद्धतेः साधर्म्यमापन्ना प्राच्यैरेवोद्भाविता प्रश्नोत्तरप्रधाना खण्डान्वयपद्धतिरध्यापने समाश्रयितव्येति साधीयान् पन्थाः । यतो दण्डान्वयपद्धतेर्मौखिकाध्यापनेऽनुसरणं—

पदच्छेदः पदार्थोक्तिर्विग्रहो वाक्ययोजना ।
आक्षेपोऽथ समाधानं व्याख्यानं पञ्चलक्षणम् ॥

इति रीत्या यद्यपि सम्यग्बोधाय कल्पते, तथापि तत् पदच्छेदकरां समासविग्रहादिपरां कर्तृकर्मक्रियाद्यन्वयभूयिष्ठां व्याकरणदृष्टिमेवाग्रे निधाय काव्यरसशोषण एव पर्यवस्यति । काव्याध्यापने खण्डान्वयपद्धत्या विरचिताः प्रश्नास्तु कर्तृकर्मादिव्याकरणसंज्ञानुच्चारेऽपि 'किमो रूपं पुरस्कृत्य' द्रव्यगुणजातिक्रियादिवाचका विधातुं शक्यन्ते, येन प्रश्नसंसूचितद्रव्यगुणक्रियादिद्वारैव वाक्यगतपदानां कर्तृकर्मक्रियाबोधश्छात्रमनस्सु स्वयमेवाविर्भूय, बोधप्ररोचनपूर्वकप्रत्युत्तरदाने तन्मतिं नियुज्य च शनैः शनैः काव्यरसं समुल्लासयतीति प्रयोगनिपुणानामध्यापकानामनुभूतिः । अतः खण्डान्वयपद्धतिर्न केवलं पदकारकबोधाय, अपि तु पदान्तर्हितव्यञ्जनासंवेदनाय रसोद्बोधाय च कल्पते । काव्याध्ययने पदकारकबोधो रसास्वादश्चान्योन्यावलम्बिनौ सन्तौ समकालमेव प्रतीतिविषयत्वं गच्छतः, शब्दार्थयोर्नित्यसाहचर्यात् । तस्मान्मीमांसकरीत्याऽऽदौ क्रियावाचकपदं गृहीत्वैवाऽऽकाङ्क्षायोग्यतासन्निधिबलेन तत्सम्बद्धानि कर्तृकर्मादिवाचकपदानि तत्तद्विशेषणानि क्रियाविशेषणादीनि च यथोत्तरं छात्रेभ्यो निष्कासनीयानि, तेषां समुचितविवरणं च रसदृष्ट्या कार्यम् । संस्कृतवाक्ये तु प्रायो गुणवाचकपदप्राचुर्यान्मुहुर्मुहुः पृष्टाः 'कीदृश'–शब्दनिबद्धाः प्रश्नाश्छात्राणां शिरोवेदनां जनयिष्यन्तीत्यतः 'कीदृश'–शब्दस्थाने 'किम्भूत–कथम्भूत–किंविशिष्ट–किंलक्षण'–इत्यादीनि पदानि प्रश्नेषु यथारुचि प्रयोक्तव्यानि । प्रदीर्घसमासस्थलेष्वपि खण्डान्वयमुखेन चतुरप्रश्नविधानेन पदविग्रहपूर्वकं तत्तत्पदानां समुचितसुबोधपर्यायाः कथयितुं शक्यन्ते । विशेषतोऽत्र ज्ञातव्यं यत्काव्याध्यापने विच्छेदकदृष्टेरपेक्षया भावैकत्वपर्यवसायिनी सङ्कलनदृष्टिरेव रससम्पदं वर्धयतितरामित्य-

नुभवाधिष्ठितः सिद्धान्तः । वैयक्तिकश्लोकस्य रसालङ्कारविवरणात्समग्र-काव्यपरिच्छेदस्य सङ्कलितसंवेदनमेव रुचिरतरम् । अत एव मुख्याभिप्रायं रसदृष्टिं च प्रमुखीकृत्य शब्दार्थयोः समुचितशाहचर्यविषये प्रश्नविवरणादिक-मपेक्ष्यते । तदर्थमेव शब्दस्पर्शरूपरसगन्धसंवेदनं काव्यगतपदसूचनेन पुनरु-द्भावयन्तश्चित्तचक्षुर्गोचराया दृश्यसन्ततेरुत्पादने समर्थाश्च प्रश्ना विरच-नीयाः । भवतु नाम प्रश्नानां कार्यकारणबोधकं तर्कानुसारित्वं, किन्तु तर्कोऽत्र काव्यकल्पनावशग एव रससाहाय्यमाचरन् काव्यसौन्दर्याभिव्यञ्जनाय भवतु, न तु रसविघाताय ।

काव्याध्यापने न केवलं प्रश्नाः प्रष्टव्याः, किन्तु कथनपरिपाटीमाश्रित्य लयकाकुविरामाद्यलङ्कृतेन संस्कृतभाषणेन सोत्साहं रसभावकल्पनाप्रति-बोधकरं मनश्चित्रमालाजनकं विवरणमपि कार्यम् । प्रश्नप्राचुर्यं काव्यविच्छेदने पर्यवस्यद्रसोत्कर्षं प्रतिबध्नाति । कथनातिरेकस्तु कविवचनसौन्दर्यं निह्नुत्य च्छात्राणां तन्द्रिलत्वमुत्पादयति । छात्रैः सम्यगवबुद्धायां काव्यकल्पनायां विवरणकथनयोः पौनःपुन्यातिरेकः कदाचिद्रसप्रवाहं स्तभ्नाति, कविवचन-वपुषो मूलसौन्दर्यं चावृणोति । अतः 'नामूलं लिख्यते किञ्चिन्नानपेक्षितमुच्यते' इति मल्लिनाथोक्तिमनुसृत्य कव्युक्तपदवैदग्ध्यं यया प्रश्नकथनप्रणाल्या प्रकाश्येत सैवाध्यापकेन मौखिकाध्यापनेऽङ्गीकार्या । कथनप्रणाली प्रश्नप्रणाली चेत्येतयोः समन्वयेन कविवचनं पुरस्कृत्यैव प्रश्नमुखेन विहितं विवरणं यशस्वितामाप्नोतीति न कदापि विस्मरणीयम् । अध्याप्यमानकाव्यद्वारा कवेरेव च्छात्रैः सार्धं विश्रम्भालापो भवतु, न स स्वीयभाषणाधिक्येना-ध्यापकेन प्रतिष्टम्भितव्य इति सारः । विवरणसमये दुरूहस्थलेषु विशिष्ट-स्थलेषु च पौराणिकसन्दर्भप्रपूरणाय प्रासङ्गिकविषयावेदनाय सामान्यज्ञान-संवर्धनाय च मातृभाषोपयोगोऽनिर्बन्धं कार्यः, यतश्छात्रसुबोधसिद्धिरेवा-ध्यापनस्य परमं प्रयोजनम् ।

शास्त्रिणो वैयक्तिकश्लोकव्याख्यानं यथा पदपदार्थविवृतिपुरस्सरं कुर्वन्ति तथा पूर्वोत्तरश्लोकयोरन्योन्यसम्बन्धसिद्धयेऽपि तयोर्मध्ये टीकाग्रन्थानु-रोधेनावतरणिकामुपन्यस्यन्ति । एषाऽवतरणिकोत्तरश्लोकाभिप्रायं संसूच्य तद्विषये जिज्ञासां चोत्थाप्य श्लोकरूपाणां विविधावयवानामन्योन्यसङ्घटनेन

समुचितविन्यासं साधयन्ती चित्तचक्षुषः पुरतोऽखण्डार्थरूपं रसवपुः संस्थापयति। एतदीपद्विच्छेदनसहकृतमर्थसङ्कलनं काव्यरसावगाहनस्यातीवोपकुरुते। तस्मादेतट्टीकाग्रन्थस्थं शास्त्रिभिरनुसृतं चावतरणिकापूरणमाधुनिकाध्यापकैरप्युरीकर्तव्यम्। आदावध्यापकेन प्रत्येकश्लोकविवरणारम्भेऽवतरणिकामुपन्यस्य पूर्वोत्तरश्लोकयोः सम्बन्धः सङ्घटनीयः, तदनन्तरमध्याप्यमानश्लोकस्य प्रश्नविवरणसमाप्तौ तं श्लोकं पुनरप्यर्थप्रतीतिस्थैर्याय वाचयित्वा तदुत्तरश्लोकावतरणिका प्रस्थाप्या, तदनु पुनर्विवरणमारम्भणीयमिति सामान्यः पन्थाः। मुख्याभिप्रायमनुरुध्य काव्यपरिच्छेदगतानां विविक्तश्लोकानामुपरिवर्णितमध्यापनमेव सुकुमारमतीनामध्येतॄणां समीचीनबोधकरं भवति।

कवेः कल्पनावैभवं वर्णनचातुर्यं रसप्रकर्षोऽलङ्कारयोजना पदलालित्यमिति विविधदृष्टीरङ्गीकृत्य स एव काव्यपरिच्छेदः पुनः पुनरप्यध्येतुं शक्यते। अस्मिन् व्यतिकरे काव्यपरिच्छेदस्थितानां श्लोकानां पूर्वापरक्रमं परिवर्ज्य तां तामुपरिदर्शितदृष्टिमनुरुध्यैव यद्यद् वस्तु परिच्छेदे लभ्यते, तस्य तस्य सङ्कलनाय प्रश्नविवरणाद्याश्रीयते। एवं कल्पनावैभवदृष्ट्या वर्णनचातुर्यदृष्ट्या वा सञ्जाते प्रश्नविवरणादौ, रसप्रकर्षविषयिण्या पदलालित्यसम्बन्धिन्या वाऽन्यदृष्ट्या प्रश्नविवरणादिभिः समग्रपरिच्छेदेऽधिगम्यमानानि वस्तूनि सङ्कल्यन्ते। इत्थं प्रभिन्नदृष्ट्यवलम्बेन स एव काव्यपरिच्छेदस्तत्तद्विशिष्टवस्तूपलब्धये मुहुर्मुहुश्छात्रैर्वाचनीयः। एतादृशे काव्याध्ययने सङ्कलनदृष्टिरेव प्रधानपदं लभते; परमनधिगतकाव्यार्थानामनधीतकतिपयकाव्यानां सुकुमारमतीनां छात्राणामियं पद्धतिर्नोपकारिणी भवेत्। अभ्यस्तपर्याप्तकाव्याः परिणतमतय एव शिष्या ईदृशाध्ययनकर्मणः शक्ताः सन्तो महान्तं लाभमावहेयुः। तस्मात्कञ्चित्कालं श्लोकक्रमानुसारेणैव काव्यमध्याप्य सञ्जातपर्याप्ताभ्यासानामेव च्छात्राणामध्यापनेऽयं पन्थाः समाश्रयणीयः।

अलङ्कारज्ञानम्। प्रारम्भिकाध्यापने वृत्तालङ्कारज्ञानं नापेक्ष्यते, किन्तु च्छात्राणां प्रौढावस्थायां काव्यविवरणप्रसङ्गतस्तद्यथावकाशं स्तोकमात्रं वितीर्य शनैः शनैः परिवर्धनीयम्। उपमाऽनन्वयरूपकभ्रान्तिमदपह्नुत्युत्प्रेक्षा-

दृष्टान्तव्यतिरेकाप्रस्तुतप्रशंसाश्लेषार्थान्तरन्यासादयः केचिद्विशिष्टालङ्कारा अध्याप्यमानकाव्यसन्दर्भानुरोधेनैव बोधनीयाः। उदाहरणभूतश्लोकस्थमुपमानोपमेयवाचकपदानां सादृश्यं तुल्यकक्षत्वं वा समुचितप्रश्नैश्छात्रेभ्यो निष्कास्य, उपमेयपदान्युपमानपदानि च स्तम्भद्वये समानपङ्क्तावेव फलके विलिख्य साधर्म्यं विशदीकर्तव्यम्। एवं विपुलोदाहरणैः परिचयं प्रापिते साधर्म्ये केनचित्कालेनालङ्काराभिधानलक्षणानि क्रमशोऽल्पाल्पमात्रया कथयितव्यानि। अधिगते चावसरे साधर्म्यमूलकालङ्कारभेदाः समानोपमानोपमेययोर्विभिन्नभङ्ग्यैव कथमुत्पद्यन्त इत्यपस्तनोदाहरणैः पृथक्कृते पाठे व्याख्येयम्।

यथा—'मुखं कमलमिव' (उपमा), 'मुखं मुखमिव' (अनन्वयः), 'मुखमेव कमलम्' (रूपकम्), 'कमलमिति भ्रमरा मुखमनुधावन्ति' (भ्रान्तिमान्), 'इदं कमलं, न मुखम्' (अपह्नुतिः), 'नूनं मुखं कमलं मन्ये' (उत्प्रेक्षा), 'जले कमलं, स्थले तव मुखम्' (दृष्टान्तः), 'मुखं कमलादतिरिच्यते' (व्यतिरेकः) इति। स्थालीपुलाकन्यायेन पाठशालायामेतावतैवालङ्कारज्ञानेनालम्। इयमीषदलङ्काराभिरुचिर्महाविद्यालयेष्वेव समुचितवेलायां काव्यप्रकाशादिग्रन्थगतालङ्काराणां सूक्ष्माभ्यासेन वृद्धिं प्राप्नुयात्।

वृत्तज्ञानम्। वृत्तज्ञानविषये तावद् वृत्तनामकथनमात्रान्नाधिकं किमपि काव्यरसग्रहणसमये कर्तुमिष्यते, यतो वृत्तलक्षणादिविवेचनेन काव्यरसोद्बोधो निरुद्धो भवतीत्यनुभवः। अतः पृथक्तया मातृभाषयैव बहूपयुक्तवृत्तलक्षणान्यध्याप्यानि, मातृभाषायामपि संस्कृतवृत्तानां प्रयोगप्राचुर्यात्। स्वतन्त्रे पाठे 'यमाताराजभानसलगाम्' इति पङ्क्तेः साभिप्रायत्वं लघुगुरुक्रमेण गणपरिगणनोपयुक्तत्वं च विशदीकृत्याक्षरसङ्ख्यानुसारेण "अनुष्टुम्—आर्या—उपजाति—द्रुतविलम्बित—भुजङ्गप्रयात—वसन्ततिलका—मालिनी—पृथ्वी—मन्दाक्रान्ता—शिखरिणी—हरिणी—शार्दूलविक्रीडित—स्रग्धरा—" इत्यादीनां प्रचुरप्रयोगाणां वृत्तानां गणनिरूपणं छात्रैः कारयितव्यम्।

वृत्तयोजनाविवरणम्। अर्थानुसारिण्यास्तु वृत्तयोजनाया विवरणं काव्यरसग्रहणकालेऽपि रसाभिरुचिवर्धनपुरस्सरं विधातुं शक्यते। यथा—

कुमारसम्भवे 'अस्त्युत्तरस्यां दिशि देवतात्मा' इत्यादिश्लोकेषु गुरुवर्ण-प्राचुर्येण नगाधिराजस्य हिमवतो गुरुत्वविस्तीर्णत्वे कथमभिव्यज्येते, मेघदूते वा मन्दाक्रान्तावृत्तं यक्षहृदयस्थं विप्रलम्भजनितं जडिमानं कथं द्योतयतीति विवरणसमेतया विशिष्टपठनशैल्या ज्ञापनीयम् ।

यथा वृत्तस्यार्थानुसारित्वं तथा विशिष्टवर्णसंहतेः समुचितार्थसूचकत्वं पदलालित्यं वा सुविशदपठनपूर्वकं प्रदर्शयितुं पार्यते । यथा कुमारसम्भवे—

यः ≍ पूरयन्कीचकरन्ध्रभागान्दरीमुखोत्थेन समीरणेन ।
उद्गास्यतामिच्छति किंनराणां तानप्रदायित्वमिवोपगन्तुम् ॥

इति श्लोके 'पूरयन्' इत्यस्मात्पदात्पूर्वमुपध्मानीयप्रयोगोऽवशिष्टे भागेऽनुनासिकप्रयोगश्च पवनाध्मानं पवनध्वनिमपि कथं सूचयतः, तथा—

कपोलकण्डू ≍ करिभिर्विनेतुं विघट्टितानां सरलद्रुमाणाम् ।
यत्र स्रुतक्षीरतया प्रसूतस्सानूनि गन्धस्सुरभीकरोति ॥

इत्यत्र ककारटकारयोर्जिह्वामूलीयस्य संयुक्तवर्णानां च प्रयोगः करिणां कपोलघर्षणे दृढत्वं, कण्डूसंवेदनाया असहनीयत्वं, द्वितीयपङ्क्तौ च रकारो वृक्षक्षीरस्य झटिति बहिर्गमनं, तदुत्तरं सकारो वातप्रेरितं गन्धप्रसरणं च कथं व्यञ्जयन्तीत्यादिरीत्या कृत्स्नमपि वर्णविन्यासवैदग्ध्यं प्रदर्शनीयम् । तथा मेघदूते च—

सङ्गीताय प्रहतमुरजाः स्निग्धगम्भीरघोषम् ।

इत्यस्यां पङ्क्तौ पठ्यमानायां 'सङ्गीताय' इति पदेऽनुस्वारेण मधुरगीतं श्रुतिपथमायातीव, तथा 'प्रहत' इति पदेन सङ्गीतसहकारिणि मृदङ्गे कराघातः, तमनु 'स्निग्धगम्भीरघोषम्' इति पदेन मृदङ्गान्निष्पद्यमानो ध्वनिः श्रूयत इवेति प्रकटपठनपुरस्सरं प्रदर्श्य तत्र च्छात्रावधानं समाकर्षणीयम् । एवं यमकानुप्रासयुक्तान्यनुकरणवाचकानि च पदानि विशेषतोऽवधानमर्हन्ति । तथा च समुचितपदप्रयोगपूर्वकं कविः कथं शब्दचित्रमालामुत्पादयतीत्येतदपि प्रश्नविवरणैः सङ्कलनदृष्ट्या रसोत्कर्षसिद्धये पाठयितव्यम् ।

पुनर्वाचनम् । एवं सप्रश्नविवरणात्सूक्ष्माध्ययनादनन्तरं सकलस्याप्यधीतकाव्यांशस्य संहतपरिणामनिष्पत्तयेऽध्यापकेनादौ तदुच्चैः पठनीयं

यथाशक्यं सुस्वरं गेयं वा। तदनु तेन च्छात्रैः सार्धं स एव काव्यांशः सङ्घशः पठनीयो गेयो वा, येन काव्यार्थसौरभं स्वरमाधुर्येण सार्कं तेषां स्मृतिसम्पुटमभिव्याप्यताननुरणनकर्मणि नियोजयेत्, मृच्छकटिकनायकेन चारुदत्तेन समं च —

तं तस्य स्वरसङ्क्रमं मृदुगिरः श्लिष्टं च तन्त्रीस्वनं
वर्णानामपि मूर्छनान्तरगतं तारं विरामे मृदुम्।
हेलासंयमितं पुनश्च ललितं रागद्विरुच्चारितं
यत्सत्यं विरतेऽपि गीतसमये गच्छामि शृण्वन्निव॥

इति रीत्या तान् सञ्जातसंवेदान् विदध्यात्।

इत्थमेकस्मिन्पाठे त्रिचतुराः श्लोकाः समाप्यन्ते। काव्यपरिच्छेदः प्रदीर्घश्चेत्तस्य यथोचितखण्डान् परिकल्प्य प्रतिपाठं ते ते खण्डा उपरितन-प्रश्नविवरणरीत्या समाप्याः। आदिमे पाठे समग्रपरिच्छेदस्य स्थूलबोधं विधाय पश्चात्प्रतिपाठं नूतनश्लोकाः पूर्वश्लोकैः सह प्रश्नकथनपूर्वकं संयोज्याः। एवमवस्थिते समग्रकाव्यपरिच्छेदाध्यापनेऽध्यापकः पुनरावृत्तिपाठेनावशिष्टं छात्रबोधवैकल्यं परिहर्तुं व्यवस्येत्।

नाटकाध्यापनम्।

नाटकस्य दृश्यकाव्यान्तर्भूतत्वात्तदध्यापनमपि पूर्ववर्णितरीत्यैव प्रायः कार्यम्। विशेषस्त्वयं यन्नाटकस्य सूक्ष्माध्ययनात्प्राग् हृदयहारिण्या सरण्या नाट्यकथावस्तुपरिचयो मुखतो विधातव्यः, येन ज्ञातपूर्वे नाट्यसंविधानके छात्राणामन्तःकरणेषु सामग्र्येण विस्पष्टत्वेन च स्थिरीभूय बोधरुचिपुरस्सरे सूक्ष्माध्ययने तान् प्रवर्तयेत्। नाट्यवस्तुकथनमनु प्रतिसमयमध्येयान्नाटकखण्डान् परिकल्प्य ते पृथक्पृथक् कथितपूर्वान्नाट्य-शास्त्रगतपाठ्यधर्माननुसृत्य विविधपात्रस्वभावानुगुणं सकौशलं प्रतिपाठं वाचनीयाः। नाटकाध्यापने सम्यग्वाचनस्येयती महती यद्विवरणं विनापि समीचीनवाचनमात्रेण प्रायो नाट्यविभागाः स्थूलत्वेनावगतार्था भवन्ति। अतोऽत्र विषयेऽध्यापकैरादौ सविशेषोद्यमः कार्यः। तदनु प्रश्नविवरणादीनि यथापूर्वमेवानुसर्तव्यानि। कथावस्तुक्रमान्नाट्यप्रवेशादिक्रमः कथं भिद्यते, कथं च परिणामावह इत्यपि विवरणसमये विवेक्तव्यम्। सूक्ष्माध्ययने ते

ते पात्रस्वभावविशेषा नाट्यप्रवेशानुरोधेन च्छात्रेभ्यः प्रश्नद्वारा निष्कासनीयाः, अध्यापकेन स्वयमपि कथनीयाः । समाप्ते तस्मिंस्तस्मिन् परिकल्पितखण्डाध्ययने प्रतिसमयं पुनर्वाचनमिष्यत एव । सत्यवसरे छात्रैर्विविधभूमिकाः परिगृह्य समुत्कृष्टप्रवेशा नाटयितव्याः, येन तेषां भाषाज्ञानं रसभावसंवेदनं च परिपाकं प्राप्स्येते ते च संस्कृतसंभाषणनिपुणा अपि सम्पद्येरन्। एवमवसिते समग्रनाटकाध्ययने प्रत्यङ्कमुपलब्धा विशिष्टपात्रस्वभावविशेषाः पर्यालोचनपुरस्सरं छात्रसाहाय्येन मुखतो लेखनतश्च सामग्र्येण सङ्कलनीयाः । प्रतिपात्रममुमेव विधिमनुसृत्य तत्तत्स्वभावविशेषाणामन्योन्यपोषकत्वं प्रदर्शनीयम् । एतत्तु संस्मरणीयं यन्नाटकाध्यापनमपि श्रव्यकाव्यमिवावयवविच्छेदनविरहेण रसप्रधानां सङ्कलनदृष्टिं पुरस्कृत्यैव भवतु ।

उपसंहारः ।

काव्यपुरुषस्य रसरूपमात्मानं, शब्दार्थरूपं शरीरं, रीतिरूपमवयवसंस्थानविशेषमुपमानुप्रासादिरूपानलङ्कारान् छन्दोरूपां गतिं चोद्दिश्य विहितानि प्रश्नविवरणानि शश्वदेव तत्सौन्दर्यनिर्वर्णने प्रचीयमानामभिरुचिं सम्पादयन्ति, अलं भूयसा, कवेर्निगूढान्तःकरणतत्त्वमेवावगाहन्ते च । किन्तु रसरूपमात्मानं हित्वाऽन्यः सकलोऽपि च्छन्दोरीत्यलङ्कारादिनिरीक्षणव्यापारो विवेचकबुद्धितन्त्रत्वात्परिणतप्रज्ञानामेवाध्येतॄणामध्यापने पदमर्हतीति न कदापि विस्मर्तव्यम् । यथा पाठशालाध्येतॄणां बालानां तथा महाविद्यालयस्थानां प्रौढच्छात्राणामध्यापने रससाधारण्यं नान्तरीयकमेव । तथापि च्छन्दोऽलङ्कारादिविवेचनं शिष्यबुद्धिवृद्ध्यनुरोधेन यथोत्तरं संवर्धनीयं, न त्वेकपदे । शास्त्रिपद्धतौ काव्याध्ययनानन्तरं साहित्यग्रन्थपठनपुरस्सरं यथा छात्राः काव्यस्यालङ्कारगवेषणाशीला अक्रियन्त, तथाऽधुनापि महाविद्यालयेषु क्रियन्त एव । किन्तु विच्छेदकबुद्धिनिष्ठमलङ्कारपरिज्ञानं रसतत्त्वप्रधानस्य साहित्यशास्त्रस्यैकतममङ्गमेव सन्न सामग्र्येण काव्यरसग्रहणायालम् । अतः प्रौढच्छात्राध्यापनेऽपि मनोविज्ञानानुसारेण भावैकतत्त्वं समवलम्ब्य संश्लेषणदृष्ट्यैव काव्यविवरणमिष्यते, न त्वलङ्कारभेदनिरूपणपरया विश्लेषणदृष्ट्या । विहितमप्यलङ्कारविवरणं काव्यगतस्थायिभावाभिव्यक्तेः साधकं भवतु, न तु बाधकम् ।

बालाध्यापने पुनरेतद्विवेचनं पाठशालासु लभ्यमानं संस्कृताध्ययनकालावधिमवलम्बते, न च सकलमपि तत्र सम्पूर्णत्वेन विधातुं शक्यम्। अतः प्रथितयशसां महाकवीनां काव्येभ्यः समुत्कृष्टावतरणानि सङ्गृह्यैव तेषामध्यापनं पाठशालासु विधेयम्। सर्गद्वयात्मकमपि काव्यमुपरिदर्शितरीत्याऽध्याप्येत चेदन्वर्थं काव्यरसानुरागं जनयेत्, व्यासवाल्मीकिकालिदासभवभूत्यादीनां चिरन्तनवाग्रसधाराया अविकलास्वादनाय च्छात्रान् प्रवर्तयेदित्यत्र न कापि विप्रतिपत्तिः सम्भाव्यते। अपि च खण्डान्वयपद्धत्या संस्कृते विहितं मौखिकविवरणं तादृशलिखितविवरणप्रधानानां टीकाग्रन्थानां वाचने कुतूहलमुत्पाद्य तत्साहाय्येन च्छात्रांष्टीकानुशीलनपरान् पूर्वतनशास्त्रिशिष्यानिव स्वयमेवार्थनिर्धारणाभिमुखान् कुर्यात्। समासतो वक्तव्ये सति, गीर्वाणभारत्यां तद्गतविशालवाङ्मये च कियद्भाववैविध्यं, कियान् रसप्रकर्षः, कियद्वर्णमाधुर्यं, कियान् पदवाक्यपाकः, कियद्वा रीतिवैचित्र्यमित्यत्र विषये स्थालीपुलाकन्यायमनुसृत्य समुत्कृष्टावतरणाध्ययनेनापि पाठशालाछात्रहृदयेषु यदीषदुद्बोधः स्यात्तदा काव्याध्यापनमसंशयं साफल्यमियात्।

पुनरेकस्यैव कवेः काव्यकृतिषु रतिविलापाजविलापयोरिव प्रसङ्गवर्णनादिसादृश्यं विभिन्नसन्दर्भानुसारेणापि कथमुपलभ्यते, समानप्रसङ्गमधिकृत्य प्रभिन्नकविकृतिषु कुन्दमालोत्तररामचरितयोरिव कथं भेदसाम्ये परिलक्ष्येते, शकुन्तलादुष्यन्तयोर्मालविकाग्निमित्रयोरुर्वशीपुरूरवसोरिव नायिकानायकयो पूर्वरागो विशिष्टकविना विविधकविभिर्वा कथं प्रदर्शितः, कविविशेषस्य प्रकृतिवर्णनविषये किं प्रवृत्तिवैशिष्ट्यं मनोऽधिष्ठानं वा, कश्च तस्य जीवितत्त्वालोक इति विविधविषयान् परिलक्ष्यीकृत्य काव्यनाटकादिसमीक्षाऽनुष्ठातुं शक्या। नाटकसमीक्षायां पुनर्नाट्यवस्तुनः पुरातनकथावलम्बः कल्पितत्वं वा, पुरातनकथावलम्बेऽपि कवेरसाधारण्यं प्रतिभानवत्वं वा, नाट्यगतघटनासिद्धयेऽपेक्ष्यमाणा कालमर्यादा, नाट्यकवेरुपलभ्यमानमितिवृत्तं, तत्कालीना समाजस्थितिः, नाटकस्थरसानां कथोपकथानां चाङ्गाङ्गिभावः, नाट्यशास्त्रनियमानां कविकृतं परिपालनमतिक्रमणं वा, कविकृतौ प्रतीयमानस्य जीविततत्त्वालोकस्यान्यकविभ्यो वैशिष्ट्यमिति विविधविषया अपि विवेचनार्हा भवन्ति। एषा समग्रकृतिसमीक्षा विविक्तश्लोकालङ्कारादिकथनाद् भिन्ना

सती भावसंश्लेषणमेवाधिकतरमधिष्ठाय कविचित्तावगाहनौपयिकी भवति। परमेषा महाविद्यालयीनप्रौढच्छात्रेष्वेव युज्यते, न बालेषु। पूर्ववर्णितरीत्या सञ्जाते काव्याध्यापने छात्रा वयोवुद्धिविकासानुरोधेन निसर्गत एवोपरिवर्णितायां काव्यसमीक्षायां सम्प्रवृत्ताः स्युः। कविकालनिर्णयः, कवीनां पूर्वोत्तरभाव इत्यादयो विषया अमन्दमतिप्रयत्ना ऐतिह्यदृष्ट्या चोपयुक्ताः सन्तोऽपि कविहृदयसमीक्षापेक्षया बहिरङ्गभूताः काव्यरसपिपासूनां रसास्वादप्रत्यूहपरा विफलकालयापनकराश्च। कविकालीनायाः समाजस्थितेः संस्कृतेश्च काव्योपलब्धसन्दर्भैर्निरीक्षणं तु कविव्यक्तित्वनिदर्शनोपकारकमपि विवेचकबुद्धिनिष्ठमेव। अतः कविचित्तावगाहननिष्ठां काव्यसमीक्षां समाश्रित्यैव रसज्ञसमीक्षकैर्लेखनमतिर्विधेया। संस्कृतवाङ्मयस्थमीदृक्समीक्षान्यूनत्वं पूरयितुं यावन्तो नूतनसमीक्षका बद्धपरिकरा भविष्यन्ति तावन्तोऽपेक्ष्यन्त एव॥



काव्याध्यापने परिशिष्टम् ।

पाठादर्शः ।

श्रेणिः—आङ्ग्लपाठशालीया पञ्चमी। कालावधिः—सार्धघटिकापरिमितः।

विषयः—शरद्वर्णनपराः श्लोकाः।

शरद्वर्णनविषयकाणां केषाञ्चिच्छ्लोकानां प्रत्यक्षाध्यापनरीतिरत्रोपस्थाप्यते। प्रकृतिवर्णनविषयकाः श्लोकाश्छात्रेभ्योऽतीव रोचन्ते। अतस्तादृशा एव प्रारम्भिकाध्यापने ग्राह्याः। ऋतुषट्कवर्णनपरेषु श्लोकेषु तस्मिंस्तस्मिन्नेव ऋतौ पाठितेषु तत्तद्दृश्यानां प्रत्यक्षानुभूत्याऽध्यापनमतिमात्रं रसप्रबोधकरं भवति। पाठादर्शगताः प्रश्नाः, प्रश्नोत्थापका विवरणपराश्च वाक्यांशा अध्यापकेन प्रयोक्तव्याः। छात्राणामपेक्षितानि प्रत्युत्तराणि ( ) इत्यर्ध-

चन्द्रचिह्नद्वये स्थापितानि । अध्यापकेन कर्तव्यं विवरणं कदाचिदर्ध-चन्द्रचिह्नद्वयाद्बहिः कदाचिच्च [ ] इति समकोणचिह्नद्वये स्थापितम् । प्रायोऽत्र विसन्धिलेखनमनुसृतम् ।

१ प्रस्तावः । छात्राणां परिचितानुभवमधिष्ठाय प्रश्नाः ।

यदा पर्जन्यः वर्षति तदा कः ऋतुः ? (वर्षाः)। पर्जन्यकाले—वर्षाकाले मेघाः जलं वर्षन्ति। मेघाः वर्णेन कीदृशाः ? (कृष्णाः)। मेघाः कुत्र दृश्यन्ते ? (आकाशे)। आकाशस्य कानि नामान्तराणि ? (नभः, गगनम्, अम्बरम् इति) (छात्रैर्ज्ञातपूर्वाणामेव पर्यायाणां निष्काशनमत्र शक्यम्। यदि पर्यायाः श्लोकगताश्छात्रैरज्ञातपूर्वाश्च, तर्हि तेऽस्मिन्नेव सन्दर्भेऽध्यापकेन कथनीयाः, फलके ज्ञातपदैः सम लेखनीयाश्च) । वर्षाकाले जलं वर्णेन कीदृशम् ? (आरक्तम्)। कस्मात्कारणात् आरक्तम् ? (तत्पङ्केन मलिनं, तस्मात्)। वर्षाकाले वायुः कथं वहति ? (वेगेन)। वायोः कानि नामान्तराणि ? (पवनः, वातः, अनिलः इत्यादीनि)। वर्षाकाले वनं वर्णेन कीदृशम् ? (हरितम्) । वर्षर्तोः अनन्तरं कः ऋतुः आगच्छति ? (शरदृतुः) । शरदि आकाशं वर्णेन कथम्भूतम् ? (नीलम्)। कस्मात्कारणात् नीलम् ? (तत्र मेघाः न सन्ति, तस्मात्)। [अतः आकाशं निरभ्रम् । तस्य वर्णः नीलः निर्मलः विधौतः वा,—इति विवरणेन श्लोकगतः 'विधौत'—शब्दः नूतनत्वात् कथनीयः फलके लेखनीयश्च] शरत्काले जलं वर्णेन कथम्भूतम् ? (निर्मलम्)। शरत्काले वायुः कथं वहति ? (मन्दं मन्दम्)। शरत्काले वनभागाः वर्णेन किम्भूताः ? (पीताः प्रसन्नाश्च)। तर्हि वर्षाकालः शरत्कालः च इति उभौ ऋतू युष्माभिः दृष्टौ । तयोः कः अतीव रम्यः ? (शरत्कालः) ।

२ सन्दर्भादिकथनम् । अद्य वयं शरत्कालस्य रम्यं वर्णनं वाच-याम । एतद्वर्णनं श्रीवाल्मीकिना रामायणे कृतम् ।

३ अध्यापकस्य वाचनम्। पूर्ववर्णितरीत्या द्विः कार्यम्। प्रथम-वाचनसमये छात्रैः पुस्तकानि नोद्घाटयितव्यानि। केवलं श्रवणेनैवार्थः पदमाधुर्यं च बोद्धव्ये, अध्यापकस्य पठनरीतिरभिनयश्च सन्द्रष्टव्यौ। प्रथम-वाचनात्पूर्वं "एतेषु श्लोकेषु यानि श्रुतिमधुराणि पदानि तानि चित्तेषु

स्थिराणि कुरुत। वाचनानन्तरं कथयत च" इति छात्रसमवधानजननार्थं निवेदनीयम्। द्वितीयवाचनात्पूर्वं तानि पदानि छात्रेभ्यो निष्कास्य फलके लेखनीयानि। द्वितीयवाचनसमये छात्रैः पुस्तकान्युद्घाटनीयानि। एवमध्यापकस्य द्विर्वाचन समाप्तं स्यात्।

पाठनीयाः श्लोकाः।

जलं प्रसन्नं कुसुमप्रहासं क्रौञ्चस्वनं शालिवनं विपक्वम्।
मृदुश्च वायुर्विमलश्च चन्द्रः शंसन्ति वर्षव्यपनीतकालम् ॥१॥
विपक्वशालिप्रसवानि भुक्त्वा प्रहर्षिता सारसचारुपङ्क्तिः।
नभः समाक्रामति शीघ्रवेगा वातावधूता ग्रथितेव माला ॥२॥
व्यक्तं नभः शस्त्रविधौतवर्णं कृशप्रवाहानि नदीजलानि।
कह्लारशीताः पवनाः प्रवान्ति तमोविमुक्ताश्च दिशः प्रकाशाः ॥३॥

४ छात्राणां मनोगत वाचनं, स्थूलप्रश्नाश्च। तदनु १ के शंसन्ति? २ सारसपक्षिणां पङ्क्तिः किं करोति? ३ कथम्भूताः पवनाः प्रवहन्ति? इति स्थूलप्रश्नत्रयमुद्दिश्य छात्रैः श्लोकाना मनोगतं वाचनं कार्यम्। अस्मिन् समये कानिचिदपरिचितपदान्यध्यापकेन छात्रसन्देहानुसारं विशदीकर्तव्यानि। अनन्तरमुपरितनैरेव स्थूलप्रश्नैश्छात्रबोधः परीक्षणीयः।

५ सूक्ष्माध्ययनम्। तदनन्तरं प्रश्नविवरणादिद्वारा पूर्वदर्शितरीत्या सूक्ष्माध्ययनं कार्यम्। यथा—

(अ) प्रथमश्लोकविवरणम्। जलं कथम्भूतं दृश्यते? (प्रसन्नम्)। कस्मात् कारणात् तत् प्रसन्नम्? (तत् निर्मलं स्वच्छं वा, तस्मात्) [वर्षाकाले तत् पङ्केन युक्तं पङ्किलं वा आसीत्। अधुना पङ्कः जलस्य तले स्थितः, अतः तत् प्रसन्नम्]। तस्मिन् जले हसन्ति–प्रहसन्ति–प्रकर्षेण हसन्ति, कानि तानि? (कुसुमानि) [पुष्पाणि, प्रसूनानि वा]। यदा यूयं हसथ, तदा युष्माकं मुखानि विकसन्ति। अत्र कुसुमानि प्रहसन्ति, तर्हि तानि कीदृशानि? (तानि विकसितानि)। कुसुमानां प्रहासः जले वर्तते, तर्हि तत् जलं किम्भूतम्? (कुसुमप्रहासम्) [अत्र समासविग्रहः प्रकारान्तरेण कर्तुं शक्यते इति दृष्टं स्यात्]। पुनश्च तस्मिन् जले स्वनः स्वरः श्रूयते, केषाम्? (क्रौञ्चानाम्) [अत्र छात्राणां विस्पष्टबोधार्थं

मातृभाषापर्यायोऽपि निवेदनीयोऽध्यापकेन]। क्रौञ्चाः * कथं शब्दायन्ते? (उच्चैः)। केन कारणेन उच्चैः? (ते आनन्दिताः)। तर्हि जलं पुनः कीदृशम्? (क्रौञ्चस्वनम्) [क्रौञ्चस्वनमिति विशेषणपदं 'शालिवनम्' इति विशेष्यपदेनापि अन्वितं स्यात्। अतस्तथा प्रश्ना अपि सम्भविष्यन्ति] पुनश्च शालीनां वनं–क्षेत्रं जलस्य समीपे एव वर्तते। [महाराष्ट्रभाषागतः 'साळी' इति शब्दोऽप्यत्र कथनीयः] कविः शालिवनं वर्णयति, केन शब्देन? ('विपक्वम्' इति) [शालिवनं विशेषेण पक्वम्, न अधुना कोमलम्] अतः तद् वर्णेन कीदृशम्? (पीतम्)। [यथा सुवर्णं शोभनवर्णं तथा शालिक्षेत्रम् अपि। पीतं शालिवनं सुवर्णमिव मनोहरं दृश्यते।] सुवर्णं धनिकानां धनम्। शालिवनमपि सुवर्णमेव, केषाम्? (कृषीवलानाम्)। [धान्यमेव कृषीवलाना धनं सुवर्णं वा।] अस्मिन् क्षेत्रे वायुः अपि वहति–वाति [पुरस्तनश्लोकगतं पदमत्र बुद्ध्या प्रयोज्यम्] कीदृशः वायोः स्पर्शः? (मृदुः) [वायुः मन्दं मन्दं वहति–वाति, तस्मात् सः मृदुः।] वायुः क्षेत्रे वहति। स शालीनां गन्धमानयति। कीदृशः सः गन्धः? (मधुरः)। शरत्काले रात्रौ चन्द्रः किम्भूतः दृश्यते? (विमलः) चन्द्रात् मलः विगतः, दूरं नीतः, व्यपनीतः। [पुरस्तनः शब्द इत्थमादावेवोचितसन्दर्भे कथनीयः] अतः सः विमलः। विमलत्वस्य किं विशिष्टं कारणम् (आकाशं निरभ्रम् इति)। चन्द्रः वर्णेन कीदृशः? (शुभ्रः)। चन्द्रस्य किरणानां स्पर्शः कथम्भूतः? (शीतलः)। चन्द्रः शुभ्रः शीतलश्च। अत एव स नयनयोः आनन्दकरः। तर्हि अत्र शंसन्ति–प्रशंसन्ति–स्तुवन्ति, कानि? (जलम्, शालिवनम्, वायुः, चन्द्रः च) [एतानि कर्तृवाचकपदानि अत्र एकैकशः निष्कासनीयानि] एतानि कं शंसन्ति? (वर्षव्यपनीतकालम्) [एतस्मात् शरत्कालात् वर्षं वृष्टिः वर्षर्तुः वा व्यपनीतः दूरं नीतः। तस्मात् अयं शरत्कालः 'वर्षव्यपनीतकालः' इति कविः वदति। उपरिवर्णिताः सर्वे रम्येण शरत्कालेन आनन्दिताः तं स्तुवन्ति, " असुखकरः वर्षर्तुः गतः, सुखकरः शरत्कालः आगतश्च इति वदन्ति इव]

(आ) प्रथमश्लोकवाचनम्–स्थूणानिखननन्यायेनार्थदृढीकरणार्थं पुनरपि कार्यम्।

(इ) द्वितीयश्लोकावतरणिका । अधुना आकाशे शालिक्षेत्रे च मनोहरा शोभा दृश्यते, तां वयं पश्याम: ।

(ई) द्वितीयश्लोकस्य वाचनं विवरणं च । अत्र समाक्रामति [अभिनयदर्शनम्] व्याप्नोति, सर्वत्र प्रसृता भवति, केषां पङ्क्तिः माला वा ? (सारसानाम्) [जलस्य तीरे वसता सारसपक्षिणां हंसानाम् इत्यर्थः] कविः तां पङ्क्तिं वर्णयति, केन पदेन ? ('चारु' इति पदेन)। सारसाना चारुः मनोहरा शोभना पङ्क्तिः वर्तते । [सा कुतः मनोहरा तद्वयं पश्यामः] सा पङ्क्तिः समाक्रामति, किम् ? (नभः) [नभः, आकाशम्, गगनम् । ' नभोऽन्तरिक्षं गगनमनन्तं सुरवर्त्म खम् ' इत्यमरः । सारसपङ्क्तिः आकाशे इतस्ततः सञ्चरति इत्यर्थः ।] कविः सारसपङ्क्तेः वेगं वर्णयति, केन पदेन ? ('शीघ्रवेगा' इति पदेन) [सा पङ्क्तिः न मन्दं मन्द गच्छति, किन्तु शीघ्रं झटिति आकाशे उड्डयते, तस्मात् तस्याः वेगः शीघ्रः वर्तते] पुनश्च सा पङ्क्तिः प्रहर्षिता—प्रकर्षेण हर्षिता—अतीव आनन्दिता, किं कृत्वा ? (भुक्त्वा) भुक्त्वा नाम भक्षयित्वा । किं भुक्त्वा सा प्रहर्षिता ? (विपक्वशालिप्रसवानि) प्रसवानि नाम मञ्जरीः कणिशानि [महाराष्ट्रभाषायां ' लोम्बी ' ' कणीस ' इति उच्यते] तानि प्रसवानि केषाम् ? (शालीनाम्)। शालयः पुनः किंविशिष्टाः ? (विपक्वाः)। शालीनां मञ्जर्यः विपक्वाः, पीताः, रुचिकरैः तण्डुलकणैः पूर्णाः, ताः भक्षयति सारसपङ्क्तिः । [यदा क्षेत्रं धान्यसम्पन्नं भवति, तदा बहवः खगाः तत्र आगच्छन्ति, धान्यकणान् यथेष्टं भक्षयन्ति च इति युष्माभिः दृष्टमेव । अतः सारसपङ्क्तिः तण्डुलकणान् यथेष्टं भक्षयित्वा प्रहृष्टा सती आकाशे झटिति उड्डयते इत्यर्थः] तदा सा का इव दृश्यते ? (माला इव)। केषां सा माला स्यात् ? (पुष्पाणाम्) किंलक्षणा माला इव ? (ग्रथिता) [ग्रथिता नाम रचिता—केन अपि सूत्रे बद्धा] पुनः सा माला अवधूता [अभिनयदर्शनम्] चालिता कम्पिता, केन ? (वातेन) [वातेन कम्पिता पुष्पाणां माला यथा मनोहरा दृश्यते, तथा इयं सारसपङ्क्तिः अपि इत्यर्थः ।]

(उ) उपमानोपमेयदर्शनम् । अत्र सारसपङ्क्तिः कया तुलिता ? (पुष्पाणां मालया)। सारसपङ्क्तिः शीघ्रवेगा, तर्हि माला कथम्भूता ?

(वातावधूता)। माला यथा ग्रथिता तथा सारसपङ्क्तिः अपि ग्रथिता सङ्घटिता एव।

सारसपङ्क्तिः।

उपमेयम्	उपमानम्
सारसपङ्क्तिः	पुष्पमाला
शीघ्रवेगा	वातावधूता

ग्रथिता

[यथाशक्य सारसपङ्क्तेश्चित्रम् उपरिलिखितरीत्या फलके आलेखनीयम्, उपमानोपमेयभावश्च उपरितनप्रश्नैः सह उपरिस्थितरीत्या फलके विशदीकार्यः। प्रारम्भे 'उपमेयम्' 'उपमानम्' चेत्येतयोः पारिभाषिकशब्दयोरुपयोगं विनैव सादृश्य विशदीकर्तव्यम्।]

(ऊ) पुनरपि द्वितीयश्लोकवाचनम्।

(ऋ) तृतीयश्लोकावतरणिका। पुनः कविः शरदः सौन्दर्यं प्रकारान्तरेण वर्णयति, तद् वयं पश्यामः।

(ॠ) तृतीयश्लोकस्य वाचनं विवरणं च। कविः नभः आकाशं वर्णयति, काभ्यां पदाभ्याम्? ('व्यक्तम्' 'शस्त्रविधौतवर्णम्' च इति)। अत्र नभसः वर्णः किम्भूतः? (विधौतः) विधौतः अतिनिर्मलः उज्ज्वलः च। किम् इव उज्ज्वलः? (शस्त्रम् इव) [शाणशिलायां शस्त्रं घृष्यते, तदा शस्त्रं निर्मलम् उज्ज्वलं च दृश्यते, तथा नभसः वर्णः अपि दृश्यते। नभः अपि निर्मलम् उज्ज्वलं च दृश्यते] नभः निर्मलम् उज्ज्वलं च, अत एव पुनः तत् कीदृशं दृश्यते? (व्यक्तम्) [व्यक्तं सुस्पष्टम्

इत्यर्थः। यतः नभः विधौतम्, ततः एव तत् व्यक्तं सुस्पष्टं वा। नभसः नैसर्गिकं नीलत्वं सुस्पष्टं दृश्यते इत्यर्थः] नभः नीलम् उज्ज्वलं च दृश्यते, किम् अत्र विशिष्टं कारणम्? (तत्र मेघाः न सन्ति)। वर्षाकाले एतद् नभः अदृश्यत एव, किन्तु तदा कः तस्य वर्णः? (कृष्णः, मलिनः)। कैः सः कृष्णः? (मेघैः)। कृष्णैः मेघैः तदा सर्वत्र अन्धकार इव तम इव आसीत्। अधुना नभः निर्मलम् उज्ज्वलं च। अतः सर्वाः दिशः कथम्भूताः? (तमोविमुक्ताः)। तमसः अन्धकारात् दिशः विमुक्ताः विशेषेण मुक्ताः। अत एव पुनश्च ताः दिशः कीदृश्यः? (प्रकाशाः)। [प्रकाशयुक्ताः, प्रकाशिताः।] अधुना नदीनां जलानि कीदृशानि? (कृशप्रवाहानि)। नदीना प्रवाहाः कृशाः सञ्जाताः, न तु प्रभूतं जल तेषु। वर्षाकाले नदीनां प्रवाहाः किंविशिष्टाः आसन्? (विशालाः) [पर्जन्यवृष्ट्या नदीनां प्रवाहाः उभे कूले–तटे उत्तीर्य सर्वत्र प्रसृताः। महान् जलपूर एव आसीत् नदीषु। सर्वत्र जलं जलमेव। किन्तु सम्प्रति नदीप्रवाहाः कृशाः प्रसन्नाश्च। अधुना पवनाः वाताः प्रवान्ति–प्रवहन्ति। ते स्पर्शेन कीदृशाः (शीताः) [ते अधुना शीताः, किन्तु सुखकरा अपि, न तु पर्जन्यवाता इव पीडाकराः] पवनाः कैः शीताः? (कह्लारैः)। [कह्लाराणि नाम श्वेतकमलानि तैः पवनाः शीताः] तर्हि कह्लाराणि कुत्र विकसितानि स्युः? (जले)। जलं जलस्थानि कह्लाराणि च स्पृष्ट्वा पवना आगच्छन्ति, अतः पवनाः गन्धेन कीदृशाः? (मधुराः)। कीदृशः तर्हि अयं शरत्कालः? (अतीव सुखकरः)।

(ल) अध्यापकेन कार्ये सर्वेषा श्लोकानां पुनर्वाचनम्।

६ पदसौष्ठवनिरीक्षणम्। 'नभः समाक्रामति शीघ्रवेगा' इत्यत्र लघुगुरुवर्णानां क्रमः सारसपङ्क्तेर्झटित्युत्पतनं, नभसो विशालोदरत्वं, तत्र च सारसाना वेगं कथं द्योतयति, 'वातावधूता ग्रथितेव माला' इति पदान्यपि गगन एव सारसानामूर्ध्वमधस्तिर्यग्गमनं कथं सूचयन्ति, तथा "कह्लारशीता ᳵ पवना ᳵ प्रवान्ति" इत्यस्यां पङ्क्तौ ह्कारोपध्मानीय-योजनया पवनस्य ध्वनिर्वहनं च कथं सूच्यते, तद्विशिष्टपठनशैल्या प्रदर्शनीयमिति दिक्।

चित्रचारुत्वनिरीक्षणम्। युष्माभिः अधीत वर्णनम् अधिकृत्य चित्रकरेण एकं चित्रम् आलेखनीयं स्यात्, तर्हि तत्र कानि कानि वस्तूनि

आलेख्यानि, के के च वर्णाः कुत्र उपयोज्याः, इत्युक्तिपुरस्सरं प्रश्नाः प्रष्टव्याः। तैश्च—

"नीलं जलम्। जले श्वेतानि कुसुमानि (कह्लाराणि?)। तीरे श्वेताः क्रौञ्चाः। तीरे विपक्वं (पीतं) शालिवनम्। शालिप्रसवानि भक्षयन्तः केचित्सारसाः (श्वेताः?) नीलमुज्ज्वलं च नभः। नभस्युत्पतन्ती केषाञ्चित्सारसाना पङ्क्तिः (श्वेता)।"

इत्यादिरीत्या छात्रेभ्यः पदानि निष्कास्य तानि फलके विलिख्य च मनोज्ञं चित्रं छात्रचित्तचक्षुषां पुरतः स्थापनीयम्। 'चन्द्रः, कृशप्रवाहा नदी' चेत्येतयोरन्तर्भाव उपरितने चित्रे न स्यात्। तदर्थं भिन्नं चित्रमपेक्ष्येत।

साङ्घिकं वाचनम्। छात्रैरध्यापकमनु सर्वे श्लोकाः पठनीया गेया वा। एतत्पठनं छात्राणामतीव रुचिकरं चिरस्मृतिजनकं च भवति।

एवं पाठादर्शे काव्याध्यापनरीतिर्दिङ्मात्रं प्रदर्शिता। अत्रैतत्तु न विस्मर्तव्यं यदध्यापनस्य चित्तरञ्जकत्वे हृदयहारित्वे वाऽध्यापकेन विहितपूर्वो रसज्ञवृत्तिसनाथः संस्कृतकाव्याभ्यासस्तदीयमुत्साहतादात्म्यादिसम्पन्नत्वं प्रत्युत्पन्नमतित्वं चैव प्रधानकारणम्। नाध्यापनपद्धतिविज्ञानमात्रं यशस्करं भवति॥



शब्दशक्तिग्रहः।



अपरिचितभाषाध्यापने पाश्चात्यभाषातत्त्वविदः शब्दार्थज्ञापनं प्रायः (१) वस्तुचित्राभिनयदर्शनपूर्वकं तत्तद्भाषागतशब्दोच्चारेण (व्यवहारेण), (२) मातृभाषानुवादेन, (३) लक्षणपर्यायादिकथनेन, (४) वाक्यगतसन्दर्भेण चेति चतुर्धा विदधति। अत्रोत्तरोत्तरस्मात्पूर्वपूर्वः प्रकारः श्रेयान्, किन्तु बालाध्यापने प्रथम एव श्रेष्ठः। द्वितीयः प्रकारोऽन्येभ्योऽपि प्रथमस्य

निकटतरत्वं वहतीत्यतो मातृभाषोपयोगोऽपि कुत्रचिन्निःशङ्कं कार्योऽध्यापकेन। तथापि यथाशक्यसम्भवं संस्कृताध्यापने सुगमगीर्वाणभाषाव्यवहारो युक्तः शब्दार्थज्ञापने।

पौरस्त्यभाषातत्त्वविदश्च—

शक्तिग्रहं व्याकरणोपमानकोशाप्तवाक्याद् व्यवहारतश्च।
वाक्यस्य शेषाद्विवृतेर्वदन्ति सान्निध्यतः सिद्धपदस्य वृद्धाः॥

इति रीत्या शब्दार्थज्ञापनप्रणालीमष्टविधां मन्यन्ते। तद्यथा—

(१) व्याकरणम्। अत्र पदपदार्थसम्बन्धज्ञानापरपर्याये शक्तिग्रहे व्याकरणमेव 'मुखं व्याकरणं स्मृतम्' इति शिक्षावचनानुसारेण मुखत्वेनाङ्गीकृतम्। धातुप्रकृतिप्रत्ययादिभिः पदरूपसिद्धिर्वाक्यगतपदानां च क्रियान्वयेन कारकज्ञापनं प्रयोगज्ञापनं चेति प्रमुखं प्रयोजनं व्याकरणस्य। किन्तु प्रकृतिप्रत्ययबलेन पदरूपसिद्धिं बालाध्ययनारम्भे क्लेशजनकां विहाय, पदविच्छेदनभूयिष्ठं यौगिकार्थज्ञापनं विहाय च, पदावयवशक्तिबोधापेक्षया पदसमुदायशक्तिबोधनं प्रारम्भे सुगमतरं मन्यमानाः पूर्वतनसम्प्रदायिनः शास्त्रिवरेण्याः शब्दरूपावलिद्वारा संहतं रूढार्थं बोधयतां सिद्धपदरूपाणामेव शिष्यैः पाठनं श्रेयोवहमित्यवधारयन्। अयं पन्था बालधीशक्त्यनुगुणः पाश्चात्यभाषातत्त्वसंवादी चेति विशेषतोऽत्र समवधेयम्। अपि च सुबन्तरूपप्रधानायाः समासबहुलायाश्च गीर्वाणभाषायाः प्रकृतिमनुसृत्य तिङन्तरूपपाठनादपि सुबन्तरूपपाठनमेव वरं, समासकारकप्रयोगज्ञानं प्राधान्येन सुबन्तरूपज्ञानावलम्बि चेति सम्यङ् निर्णीय, शब्दरूपावलीसमासचक्रान्तर्गतं व्याकरणमेव वाङ्मयाध्ययनसंनिधानेन स्थिरीकृतं व्युत्पत्तिसिद्धयेऽलं, पञ्चमहाकाव्याध्ययनानन्तरमेव सिद्धान्तकौमुद्यादिमुखेन व्याकरणशास्त्राध्ययनं श्रेय इति निरचिन्वन् दाक्षिणात्याः शास्त्रिवराः। 'लक्ष्यलक्षणे व्याकरणम्' इति वार्तिकानुसारेण 'शब्दो लक्ष्यः, सूत्रं लक्षणं' च। अतो लक्षणात्पूर्वं लक्ष्यमधिकृत्यैव दाक्षिणात्यानामध्यापनप्रणाली प्रचलिता।

किञ्च संहिताब्राह्मणादिकालात्प्रभृति पञ्चमहाकाव्यकालपर्यन्तमुत्तरोत्तरं गीर्वाणभाषा स्वकीयमाख्यातप्राधान्यं परित्यज्य सुबन्तप्रधान

समासबहुला च सञ्जातेति स्वर्गीयश्रीभाण्डारकरमहोदयानामेव सिद्धान्तः[1]। एतत्परिवर्तनानुसारेणाध्यापनेऽपि व्याकरणस्य, तद्गतप्रकरणानां पूर्वोत्तरभावः सुबन्ततिङन्तक्रमेण शनैः शनैः परिवृत्त इत्यनुमीयते। भगवान् पतञ्जलिरात्मनः पूर्वं व्याकरणाध्ययनं कथं प्रचलितमित्यत्र विषये ब्रवीति। यथा—

"पुराकल्प एतदासीत्। संस्कारोत्तरकालं ब्राह्मणा व्याकरणं स्माधीयते। तेभ्यस्तत्तत्स्थानकरणनादानुप्रदानेभ्यो वैदिकाः शब्दा उपदिश्यन्ते। तदद्यत्वे न तथा। वेदमधीत्य त्वरिता वक्तारो भवन्ति 'वेदान्नो वैदिकाः शब्दाः सिद्धा लोकाच्च लौकिकाः। अनर्थकं व्याकरणम्' इति। तेभ्य एवं विप्रतिपन्नबुद्धिभ्योऽध्येतृभ्यः सुहृद् भूत्वाऽऽचार्यः (पाणिनिः) इदं शास्त्रमन्वाचष्टे" इति।

आ पतञ्जलेर्भूरिकालं यावत्पाणिन्यष्टाध्यायीक्रमेणैवादौ सूत्रपठनं तदनु काशिकाध्ययनं तदुत्तरं च पातञ्जलमहाभाष्याध्ययनमित्ययं क्रमः स्थूलतः प्रवृत्तः, यतः पाणिनेः पूर्वस्मात्कालादारभ्य पतञ्जलिपर्यन्तं तदूर्ध्वमपि गीर्वाणभाषाया भाष्यमाणत्वाद् बालैर्ज्ञातपूर्वत्वाच्च बाल्य एव 'रक्षोहागमलघ्वसन्देहार्थं' व्याकरणपठनं भाषामुखेनैव प्राचलदिति निश्चीयते। काशिकायाः समकालिकाद् व्याकरणनियमोदाहरणपराद्भट्टिकाव्यात्तदनुवर्तिभ्यश्च काव्येभ्यः—यथा भौमककृतं रावणार्जुनीयं, हलायुधविरचितं कविरहस्यं, हेमचन्द्रनिर्मितं द्व्याश्रयकाव्यम्—इत्यादिभ्योऽवधार्यते यल्लक्ष्यलक्षणयोः (वाङ्मयव्याकरणयोः) अध्ययनमेकसमयावच्छेदेनैव प्रस्तुतमासीन्न तु व्याकरणपूर्वकमिति। व्याकरणाध्यापनेऽपि पाणिनिसूत्रक्रम उत्तरोत्तरं भाषापरिवर्तनानुरोधेन बालबोधसौकर्यानुरोधेन चादौ सुबन्तप्रकरण पश्चात्तिङन्तप्रकरणमित्यानुपूर्व्या परिणतिं गत इत्यत्र विषये कातन्त्रसारस्वतमुग्धबोधादिसुगमव्याकरणानि, तत्पश्चाद्द्राविषु पाणिनीयमतानुसारिग्रन्थेषु च विमलसरस्वतिकृता रूपमाला, रामचन्द्रनिर्मिता प्रक्रियाकौमुदी, भट्टोजिदीक्षितविरचिता सिद्धान्तकौमुदी चेति ग्रन्थाः सन्ति विशिष्टानि निदर्शनानि। वाररुचसङ्ग्रहादिका अन्येऽपि बहवो बालोपयोगिनो ग्रन्था सुबन्तकारकसमा-

---

1 Read 'Wilson Philological Lectures'. Chapter I. p. 24.
(Edition-1914)

-सतद्धिततिङ्कृदादिक्रममेव पुरस्कृत्य बहुभिर्जनैर्विरचिताः। इयं प्रवृत्तिरेतदेव साधयति यत्तिङन्तरूपपाठनात्प्रागेव सुबन्तरूपपाठनं भाषास्वरूपानुसारेण प्रभूतोपयुक्तम्। शास्त्रिभिरनुसृतं बालानां शब्दरूपावलिसमासचक्रपाठनमस्या एव प्रवृत्तेः प्रमाणम्।

वाङ्मयावबोधे वाक्यार्थः कारकप्रयोगज्ञानमवलम्बते, कारकप्रयोगज्ञानं तिङन्तरूपावलम्बि चेति सत्यम्। किन्तु तदर्थं सविस्तरा क्रियापदरूपसाधनिका सामान्यच्छात्राणां नापेक्षिता, स्थूलं क्रियापदज्ञानं पर्याप्तमिति निपुणं विचार्य केचिच्छास्त्रिवरा अध्ययनारम्भे शब्दरूपावलीपाठनादनन्तरं छात्रान् धातुरूपावलीद्वारा सिद्धतिङन्तरूपाण्येव पाठयन्ति, न तु रूपसाधनिकायामभिनिविशन्ते। विशेषतोऽत्र ज्ञातव्यं यत्र सर्वेऽपि शास्त्रिणः पूर्वं वैयाकरणा अभवन्। ते रूपावलीसमासचक्रगतेन व्याकरणमात्रेण वाङ्मयमधीत्य न्यायादिशास्त्रमात्राध्ययनरतास्तस्मिंस्तस्मिन्नेव शास्त्रे प्रगाढपाण्डित्यमलभन्त। इयं पूर्वतनी स्थितिः सविशेष चित्तगोचरीकार्या भाषापरिचयं विना, वाङ्मयाध्ययनं विनापि बहुकालं यावत्क्रियापदरूपसाधनिकायामेव च्छात्रबुद्धिं क्लेशयद्भिराङ्ग्लपाठशालाध्यापकैः।

(२) उपमानम्। गोसदृशो गवयपदवाच्य इति सादृश्यज्ञानमिव परिचितवस्तुपदादिसादृश्येनापरिचितवस्तुपदादिपरिचय उपमानम्। निखिलैर्दार्शनिकैरुररीकृतमप्येतदुपमानप्रमाणमाह्लादकारिणा साधर्म्येण काव्यश्रीवर्धनकरं विषयावबोधप्ररोचनपरमित्यालङ्कारिकाणां सविशेषं शिरोधार्यम्। अतः साहित्यानुरागिणां शास्त्रिवराणा प्रचुरोपमानप्रमाणपुरःसरमध्यापनमपि शिष्याणा मनोविनोदजनकं भवति।

(३) कोशः। कोशादपि शक्तिग्रहो भवतीत्यतः शास्त्रिवराश्छात्रैरमरादिकोशगतानुपयुक्तपर्यायबहुलान् विशिष्टभागान् पाठयन्ति, ये भागाश्छात्रव्युत्पत्तिबलं संवर्ध्य काव्याध्ययनकाले प्रभूतोपयोगिनः। किन्त्वसति वाङ्मयसन्दर्भेऽवबोधपूर्वे विहितमेतदध्ययनं क्लेशोत्पादनात्प्रारम्भे विफलं, सञ्जाते वाङ्मयाध्ययने सफलमित्यनुभवमाश्रित्य किञ्चिद्वाङ्मयाध्ययनानन्तरमेवारम्भणीयमिति भाति।

(४) आप्तवाक्यम्। आप्तवाक्यादपि शक्तिग्रहो यथा 'कोकिलः पिकशब्दवाच्य' इति रीत्या शब्दप्रमाणपुरस्सरं परिचितपदैः सममपरिचित-

पदबोधो विधीयते। आप्तो यथार्थवक्ता यथाभूतस्याबाधितार्थस्योपदेष्टा वेति कल्पनायां पुरस्कृतायामध्यापकोऽप्यत्राऽऽप्तो भवितुमर्हति।

(५) व्यवहारः। लोकव्यवहारसामान्येनापि शक्तिग्रहो भवतीति पूर्वतनप्राच्यदार्शनिकैरेव समुद्भावितं भाषाभ्यासतत्त्वम्। अत्र विषये न्यायसिद्धान्तमुक्तावल्यामुक्तं यत्—

"यथा प्रयोजकवृद्धेन (गुरुणा वा) घटमानयेत्युक्तम्। तच्छ्रुत्वा प्रयोज्यवृद्धेन (अन्येन गुरुणा शिष्येण वा) घट आनीतः। तदवधार्य पार्श्वस्थो बालो घटानयनरूपं कार्यं 'घटमानय' इति शब्दप्रयोज्यमित्यवधारयति। ततश्च 'घटं नय, गामानय' इत्यादावावापोद्वापाभ्यां (अन्वयव्यतिरेकाभ्यां) घटादिपदानां कार्यान्वितघटादौ शक्तिं गृह्णाति" इति।

न्यायसिद्धान्तमञ्जर्यामप्ययमेव विषयो विस्तरेणोक्तः। यथा—

"प्रथमतः शक्तिग्रहो व्यवहाराद् घटानयनादिरूपाद्भवति। तथा हि 'घटमानय' इति केनचित्प्रयोजकवृद्धेन नियुक्तः कश्चन प्रयोज्यवृद्धस्तद्वाक्यतोऽर्थं प्रतीत्य घटमानयति। तच्चोपलभमानो बालस्तया क्रियया तस्य प्रयोज्यस्य प्रयत्नमनुमिनोति। तेन च घटानयनगोचरप्रयत्नेन तस्य ज्ञानं घटानयनगोचरमनुमिनोति। स्वप्रयत्ने तेन तथा निश्चयात्। ततस्तद्धेत्वाकाङ्क्षायामुपस्थितत्वाच्छब्दमेव कल्पयति। तदनन्तरं घटादिपदानां प्रत्येकमावापोद्वापाभ्यां घटपदं घटधीजनकमिति कल्पयति। क्लृप्ते च तस्मिन्नतिप्रसङ्गभङ्गाय तज्जननानुकूलसङ्केतरूपं सम्बन्धं कल्पयति। अत्रातिप्रसङ्गस्तु घटपदं घटधीजनकमिव पटधीजनकमपि स्यादिति अगृहीतशक्तिकानामपि घटबोधः स्यादिति वा बोध्यः। तत आद्यशक्तिग्रहानन्तरमुपमानादिभिः शक्तिग्रहो भवति" इति।

अत्र घटानयनकार्योपालम्भः, आनयनप्रयत्नानुमानम्, स्वप्रयत्नस्मरणपुरस्सरं निश्चयः, शब्दार्थयोः प्रकल्पनम्, अन्वयव्यतिरेकज्ञानेन प्रतिपदार्थाध्यवसायः, अनुकूलसङ्केतकल्पनं चेति पार्श्वस्थबालस्य सकलोऽपि मानसिको व्यापार आधुनिकमनोविज्ञानवर्णितस्य मानसिकव्यापारस्य सुतरां सादृश्यं वहतीति चेतश्चमत्कारजनकम्। पाश्चात्यानां संवादपद्धति-

रप्यमुमेव मानसिकव्यापारमधिष्ठाय बालानां भाषाध्यापने प्ररोचनावर्धन-पुरस्सरं प्रचलतीति सुविज्ञातं भवेन्मर्मज्ञैः। अत इयं पद्धतिः प्राच्यदार्श-निकानुयायिन्येवेति निश्चित्य संस्कृताध्यापकैरियं भाषाध्यापने संस्कृत-वाग्व्यवहाररूपेणाङ्गीकार्या।

काव्यप्रकाशेऽप्यमुमेव विषयं प्रकारान्तरेण प्रतिपाद्य मीमांसैक-देशिनामन्विताभिधानवादिनामेवैतन्मतमित्युक्तम्। यथा—

"—'देवदत्त, गामानय' इत्युत्तमवृद्धवाक्यप्रयोगाद्देशाद्देशान्तरं सास्नादिमन्तमर्थं मध्यमवृद्धे नयति सति 'अनेनास्माद्वाक्यादेवंविधोऽर्थः प्रतिपन्नः' इति तच्चेष्टयानुमाय, तयोरखण्डवाक्यवाक्यार्थयोरर्थापत्त्या वाच्यवाचकभावलक्षणं सम्बन्धमवधार्य बालस्तत्र व्युत्पद्यते। परतः 'चैत्र, गामानय। देवदत्त, अश्वमानय। देवदत्त, गां नय' इत्यादिवाक्यप्रयोगे तस्य तस्य शब्दस्य तं तमर्थमवधारयतीति अन्वयव्यतिरेकाभ्यां प्रवृत्ति-निवृत्तिकारि वाक्यमेव प्रयोगयोग्यमिति वाक्यस्थितानामेव पदानाम-न्वितैः पदार्थैरन्वितानामेव सङ्केतो गृह्यत इति विशिष्टा एव पदार्था वाक्यार्थः। न तु पदार्थानां वैशिष्ट्यम्। यद्यपि वाक्यान्तर-प्रयुज्यमानान्यपि प्रत्यभिज्ञाप्रत्ययेन तान्येवैतानि पदानि निश्चीयन्ते इति पदार्थान्तरमात्रेणान्वितः पदार्थः सङ्केतगोचरस्तथापि सामान्यावच्छादितो विशेषरूप एवासौ प्रतिपद्यते, व्यतिषक्तानां पदार्थानां तथाभूतत्वादि-त्यन्विताभिधानवादिनः" इति।

अयमेव मानसतत्त्वावलम्बी प्राच्यानां सिद्धान्तः पाश्चात्यानां संवाद-पद्धतौ प्रथमत्वमधिगम्य वस्तुचित्राभिनयदर्शनपूर्वके तत्तद्वाचकनूतनपद-पाठने भाषायाः प्रत्यक्षव्यवहारे च पर्यवस्यति। पाश्चात्यभाषातत्त्वविदोऽ-प्यन्विताभिधानवादिन इव वाक्यवादिनः, न त्वभिहितान्वयवादिन इव पदवादिनः।

मानसिकस्याव्यक्तार्थस्यैव व्यक्तशब्दरूपेण प्रस्फुरणाद्विवर्ताद्वा शब्दार्थयोः सिद्धः (नित्यः) सम्बन्धो वर्तत इत्यभिप्रेत्य शब्दस्य बहिर्निर्गमनव्यापारविषये, तथा च व्यवहारतो जाते शक्तिग्रहे, सङ्घट-

मानमानसव्यापारविषये च दुर्गाचार्यो 'व्याप्तिमत्त्वात्तु शब्दस्य' (निरुक्तं १।२।४) इति निरुक्तपङ्क्तिं व्याचिख्यासुर्व्रूते । यथा—

"कथं पुनर्व्याप्तिमान् शब्द इति ? शृणु—शरीरे ह्यभिधानाभिधेयरूपा बुद्धिर्हृदयान्तर्गताकाशप्रतिष्ठिता । तयोरभिधानरूपाभिधेयरूपयोर्बुद्ध्योर्मध्येऽभिधानरूपया शास्त्राभिमतप्रयोजनविजिज्ञापयिषया बुद्ध्या पुरुषेण तदभिव्यक्तिसमर्थेन स्वगुणभूतेन प्रयत्नेनोदीर्यमाणः शब्द उरःकण्ठादिवर्णस्थानेषु निष्पद्यमानस्तथा पुरुषार्थाभिधानसमर्थवर्णादिभावमापद्यमानः पुरुषप्रयत्नेन बहिर्विनिक्षिप्तोऽविनाशिनि व्यक्तिभावमापन्नः श्रोत्रद्वारेणानुप्रविश्य प्रत्याय्यस्य बुद्धिं सर्वार्थरूपां सर्वाभिधानरूपां च प्रोतांत्येव व्याप्तिमाञ्छब्दः । ......स शब्दः स्वमर्थमभिदधत् स्वक्रियाप्रवेशोपजनितेनाभिधानेनाख्यातमित्येवमादिना स्वमात्मानमभिसम्बध्य तिरोभवितुमुपक्रमते विनाशं चोपैति । ...... पुरुषप्रयत्नोपजनिताद् वक्त्रोद्घातात्परस्यार्थप्रत्ययमाधाय शब्दव्यक्तय एव ध्वंसन्ते, न तु शब्दाकृतयः । तास्तु तयाभिधानशक्त्या बुद्धिद्वारेणावस्थिताः स्वानर्थान् प्रकाशयन्त्यः स्थिता एव भवन्ति ।" इति ॥

मनस उद्बुद्धत्वानुद्बुद्धत्वे प्रतिपादयत आधुनिकमनोविज्ञानान्न किञ्चिदप्युशरितनं प्रतिपादनं भिद्यत इत्यालोच्य चित्रीयेत कस्यापि चेतः ।

अपि च संवादपद्धतिगतं शब्दसहकृतं यद्वस्तुचित्राभिनयादिदर्शनं तस्योपयोगः परिमितत्वं चेति विषये महर्षियास्कवचनं यथा—'अणीयस्त्वाच्च शब्देन संज्ञाकरणं व्यवहारार्थं लोके' (१।२।५)। अत्र दुर्गाचार्यो व्याख्याति यथा—"अभिनया अपि व्याप्तिमन्तः पाणिविहाराक्षिनिकोचादयः ।...... न त्वणीयांसः, ते महता यत्नेन व्याप्नुवन्ति, न च निःसन्दिग्धं कुर्वन्ति । तत्प्रतीतार्थसम्बन्धस्यैव, नेतरस्य । शब्दस्त्वपरिमितमर्थमल्पीयसा यत्नेनोच्चारितो व्याप्नोति । तस्मादणीयस्त्वादिति विशेषहेतूपपत्त्या शब्देनैव संज्ञाकरणं लोके इत्युपपन्नम्" इति ।

व्यवहारेऽभिनयादीनामर्थवाचकत्वमत्राभ्युपगम्यते । किन्तु शब्दसहकृता एवाभिनयादयो निःसन्दिग्धबोधे समर्थाः, शब्दस्य व्याप्तिमत्त्वादणीयस्त्वाच्चेति यास्कदुर्गवचनाशयः । तस्माच्छब्दशक्तिग्रहे वस्तुचित्राभिनयदर्शनस्य

परिमितत्वेऽप्युपयुक्तत्वं वर्तत इति भावः। अयं भावोऽधस्तनेन वचनेनापि सावष्टम्भो भवति। यथा—

" अङ्गुलीप्रसारणादिपूर्वकं निर्देशेन शक्तिग्रहो भवति। यथा—बाल, तवेयं माता, तवायं पिता, अयं ते भ्राता कन्दलीफलमभ्यवहरतीति निर्देशेन बालस्य मात्रादौ शक्तिग्रहः।" (न्यायकोशः)

शक्तिग्रहे शब्दार्थज्ञापनविषये वाऽध्याप्यमानभाषाया अभिनयसमन्वितो व्यवहार एव श्रेयान्, स एवाऽऽद्यः, 'शक्तिग्राहकशिरोमणिः' इति प्राच्यशास्त्रविदामपि प्रथितः सिद्धान्तः। प्राच्यप्रतीच्यभाषातत्त्वविदामत्र विषयेऽभेद एव नयनविषयमायातीत्यतः साभिप्रायमेवावतरणषट्कमुपर्युपन्यस्तम्। अतो संस्कृताध्यापने संवादपद्धत्यनुसरणं पाश्चात्यानुकरणमात्रमिति दुर्ग्रहः सर्वथा परिवर्जनीयः।

नन्वयं व्यवहारः शिशोर्मातृभाषाभाषणशक्तिसम्पादन एव गृहजनानुकरणेन प्रचलति, न तु संस्कृताङ्ग्लादिनूतनभाषावगतौ। अपरिचितभाषाधिगमे मातृभाषानुवादपद्धतिरेव श्रेयसीति चेत्, न। मानसतत्त्वानुसारेण मनुजचित्तेषु भाषाधिगमस्य या स्वाभाविकी प्रवृत्तिर्निलीना, या च शैशवे निसर्गत एवातिमात्रमुद्बुद्धत्वेन मातृभाषावगमे बहूपयुक्ता, या पुनः प्रौढे वयस्युपयोगाभावान्नष्टेव भाति, किन्तु कृतोपयोगा सती प्रौढत्वेऽपि नूतनभाषाधिगमसमये पुनरप्युद्बुध्य प्रभूतोपकारिणी भवति, सैव बालानां नूतनभाषावगतावपि प्रयुक्ता सती प्ररोचका चिरसंस्कारोत्पादिनी च भवतीति सन्देहातीतमेव। कोशव्याकरणानुवादादीनि प्रौढच्छात्रोपयुक्तानि भाषाज्ञानसाधनानि सन्ति प्रयत्नतन्त्राणि, न तु स्वाभाविकप्रवृत्तितन्त्राणि। लोकव्यवहारस्य स्वाभाविकप्रवृत्तितन्त्रत्वादाद्यत्वं शक्तिग्राहकशिरोमणित्वं वा सुव्यक्तमेव। तथापि यथाप्रसङ्ग समाश्रितेषु व्यवहारसहकृतकोशव्याकरणानुवादादिषु च्छात्राणां महद्धितं स्यादित्यत्र नास्ति सन्देहलवोऽपि। अत्र शब्दार्थयोर्नित्यसम्बन्धं व्यवहारव्याकरणयोरन्योन्याश्रयित्वं च प्रतिपादयतो भगवतः पतञ्जलेरेवमाशयः—

" कथं पुनर्ज्ञायते सिद्धः शब्दोऽर्थः सम्बन्धश्चेति? लोकतः। यल्लोकेऽर्थमर्थमुपादाय शब्दान् प्रयुञ्जते, नैषां निर्वृत्तौ यत्नं कुर्वन्ति...

न तद्वच्छब्दान्प्रयुयुक्षमाणो वैयाकरणकुलं गत्वाऽऽह–कुरु शब्दान् प्रयोक्ष्य इति। तावत्येवार्थमुपादाय शब्दान्प्रयुञ्जते। यदि तर्हि लोक एषु प्रमाणं, किं शास्त्रेण क्रियते? लोकतोऽर्थप्रयुक्ते शब्दप्रयोगे शास्त्रेण धर्मनियमः क्रियते।" (पातञ्जलमहाभाष्ये पस्पशाह्निकम्)

पतञ्जलेः समये संस्कृतभाषाव्यवहारपूर्वकमेव व्याकरणशास्त्राध्ययनं प्रचलितमासीदिति सुव्यक्तं प्रतीयते। अत एवाधुनापि संस्कृताध्यापकैर्भाषाव्यवहारपूर्वकं व्याकरणमध्यापनीयमित्यत्र भावः। आदौ भाषाऽनन्तरं व्याकरणमिति न्यायेन लोकव्यवहारसामान्यादर्थप्रयुक्ते शब्दप्रयोग एव धर्मनियमं कुर्वतो व्याकरणशास्त्रस्याध्यापनं श्रेय इत्ययं भाषाधिगमस्य नैसर्गिकः क्रमः प्राच्यप्रतीच्यभाषातत्त्वविदां परमसंमतः। अत इदानीमपि संस्कृताध्यापनेऽयं क्रमः परिपालनीय इत्याकूतम्। नूतनभाषाध्ययने पुनर्भाषाव्यवहारं परित्यज्य सर्वत्रापि मातृभाषानुवादपद्धतिरेवोपयोक्तव्येति स्याच्चेत्कस्यापि मिथ्याग्रहस्तर्हि स कथयतु,–संस्कृतमूलग्रन्थव्याख्यानपराः सर्वेऽपि टीकाग्रन्थाः संस्कृतभाषायामेव किमर्थं विरचिता इति।

(६) वाक्यशेषः। प्रकृतार्थस्य सन्देहे वाक्यशेषात्प्रमाणभूतवाक्यान्तराद्वा विशिष्टशब्दार्थोऽवधार्यते। यथा–'अक्ताः शर्कराः (मृत्तिकामिश्राः क्षुद्रपाषाणाः) उपदधाति' इत्यत्र 'शर्कराः केनाङ्क्तव्याः' इति प्राप्ते सन्देहे 'तेजो वै घृतम्' इति वाक्यशेषात् 'शर्करा घृतेनाङ्क्तव्याः, न तु तैलादिना' इत्यर्थो निर्धार्यते। 'येन पदेनानुक्तेन वाक्यं समाप्येत स वाक्यशेषः' वा (सुश्रुतसंहिता, उत्तरतन्त्रम्, अ. ६५)। अयं वाक्यशेषो मीमांसकानां विशिष्टार्थनिर्धारणरीतिं प्रकटयति।

(७) विवृतिः। "विवरणादपि शक्तिग्रहः। विवरणं तु तत्समानार्थकपदान्तरेण तदर्थकथनम्। यथा घटोऽस्तीत्यस्य कलशोऽस्तीत्यनेन विवरणाद् घटपदस्य कलशे शक्तिग्रहः। एवं पचतीत्यस्य पाकं करोतीत्यनेन विवरणादाख्यातस्य यत्नार्थकत्वं कल्प्यते।" (न्यायसिद्धान्तमुक्तावलिः)

एषा विवृतिष्टीकाविवरणव्याख्याव्याख्यानाद्यपरपर्याया यथा मुखतस्तथा ग्रन्थतोऽपि विधातुं शक्यते। "मूलग्रन्थस्याप्रतिपत्तिविप्रतिपत्त्यन्यथाप्रतिपत्तिनिवारणेन तत्कर्तुरभिप्रेतस्य शब्दान्तरेण विवरणं टीका"

(न्यायकोशः)। 'यथासम्भवमर्थस्य टीकनं' वा टीका (काव्यमीमांसा)। अयं सामान्यवाची टीकाशब्दः 'टीकते गमयति बोधयति प्रकाशयति वाऽर्थम्' इति धात्वर्थात्सिध्यति। याऽर्थं विवृणोति व्यनक्ति प्रकाशयति स्फोटयति वा विवृतिर्विवरणं वा। मुखतो ग्रन्थतो वा तत्समानार्थकपदान्तरेण विशेषेण विस्तरेण यदाख्यानं कथनं तद् व्याख्यानम्। 'अतिशयवर्णना व्याख्यानं' वा (कौ. अर्थशास्त्रम्, १५।१५०)। उक्तं च 'व्याख्यानतो विशेषप्रतिपत्तिर्न हि सन्देहादलक्षणम्' इति। तथा च "न केवलं चर्चापदानि व्याख्यानम्–वृद्धिः–आत्–ऐच्–इति। किं तर्हि? उदाहरणं प्रत्युदाहरणं वाक्याध्याहार इत्येतत्समुदितं व्याख्यानं भवति। अविजानत एतदेवं भवति" इति (व्या. महाभाष्यम्, प्रथमाह्निकम्)। व्याख्यानस्य पराशरपुराणे लक्षणं यथा—

पदच्छेदः पदार्थोक्तिर्विग्रहो वाक्ययोजना।
आक्षेपोऽथ समाधानं व्याख्यानं पञ्चलक्षणम्॥ इति।

विवरणव्याख्यानादीनामन्येऽपि तदर्थवाचिनः 'प्रवचनादयः' पर्यायाष्टीकाग्रन्थनामकरणायोपयुज्यन्ते, किन्तु सर्वमप्येतद्विधं वाङ्मयं सामान्यवाचिना टीकापदेनैव व्यपदिश्यते।

टीकाया वृत्तिपद्धतिभाष्यसमीक्षाचूर्णिपञ्जिकाकारिकावार्तिकसङ्ग्रहादयोऽन्येऽपि भेदाः। तेषां लक्षणानि यथा—

"सूत्राणां सकलसारविवरणं वृत्तिः। सूत्रवृत्तिविवेचनं पद्धतिः। आक्षिप्य भाषणाद्भाष्यम्। अन्तर्भाष्यं समीक्षा। अवान्तरार्थविच्छेदश्च सा (समीक्षा चूर्णिर्वा)। विषमपदभञ्जिका पञ्जिका। अर्थप्रदर्शनकारिका कारिका। उक्तानुक्तदुरुक्तचिन्ता वार्तिकमिति शास्त्रभेदाः।" (काव्यमीमांसा)

यद्वा सूत्राणां समग्रतात्पर्यस्य यद् व्याख्यानं सा वृत्तिः। सूत्रस्य वृत्तेश्च तात्पर्यं विविच्य यस्यामितिकर्तव्यताप्रकारः कथ्यते सा पद्धतिः। पूर्वपक्षखण्डनपूर्वकमुत्तरपक्षेण सिद्धान्तकथनं भाष्यम्।

सूत्रार्थो वर्ण्यते येन पदैः सूत्रानुसारिभिः।
स्वपदानि च वर्ण्यन्ते भाष्यं भाष्यविदो विदुः॥

इत्यपि भाष्यलक्षणम्। मध्येभाष्यं यो विमर्शस्तस्य सङ्कलनेन सम्यगीक्षणं समीक्षा। सा समीक्षा प्रधानान्तर्वर्तिनोऽवान्तरार्थस्य पृथक्करणम्। 'अवान्तरार्थविच्छेदश्च सा चूर्णिः' इति गृहीते पाठे, या चूर्णयति खण्डयति पूर्वपक्षिणामवान्तरार्थरूपं दुस्तर्कं सा चूर्णिर्महाभाष्यं वेत्यर्थः समुदेति। विषमाणां दुरूहाणां पदानां भञ्जिका अर्थाविष्कारिका पञ्जिका। छन्दोरूपेण या सूत्रार्थं प्रदर्शयति सा कारिका। सूत्रकृता येऽर्था उक्ताः, अनवधानतोऽनुक्ता दुरुक्ताश्च तेषां चिन्ता विमर्शो यत्र तद् वार्तिकम्।

उक्तानुक्तदुरुक्तानां चिन्ता यत्र प्रवर्तते।
तं ग्रन्थं वार्तिकं प्राहुर्वार्तिकज्ञा मनीषिणः॥

इत्यपि पराशरपुराणे वार्तिकलक्षणम्। सङ्ग्रहलक्षणं यथा—

विस्तरेणोपदिष्टानामर्थानां सूत्रभाष्ययोः।
निबन्धो यः समासेन सङ्ग्रहं तं विदुर्बुधाः॥ इति।

सर्वेऽप्येते टीकाभेदाः शास्त्रभेदा इति संसूच्य टीकाशब्दो राजशेखरेण शास्त्रापरपर्यायवाची गृह्यते। शिष्यतेऽनेनेति, शास्ति च त्रायते चेति वा शास्त्रमिति व्युत्पादनेन शास्त्रमत्र ज्ञानस्य नियमनं व्यवस्थापनं शिष्यबुद्ध्यनुसारेण च यथाक्रमं सम्यगवबोधनं मुखतो ग्रन्थतोऽध्यापनं वेत्यर्थमवगमयति। शास्त्रशब्दोऽत्र न केवलं विशिष्टसम्प्रदायवाची किन्तु षड्दर्शनवाची वैदिकावैदिकसर्वदर्शनसङ्ग्राहकश्च ग्राह्यः, सर्वेष्वपि यथाशक्ति ज्ञानव्यवस्थितिसामान्यत्वात्। विविधैष्टीकाभेदैरेव संस्कृतवाङ्मयं तद्गतेन शास्त्रजातेन सह सुविस्तृतिमापन्नमित्यतः संस्कृतवाङ्मयस्यासङ्ख्यटीकासङ्कुलत्वं शास्त्रभूयिष्ठत्वं वेति व्यवच्छेदो भवति। भाषाया उत्तरोत्तरं परिवृत्तिस्तदनुरोधेनोत्तरकालीनैर्जनैः पूर्वकालीनग्रन्थानामनवगम एव टीकावाङ्मयविवृद्धेर्मूलम्। अपि च गुरुमुखपरम्परयाऽऽगतं ज्ञानं कदाचित्कालदेशदोषतः क्षीणत्वं प्राप्नोति, खण्डितं वा भवतीत्यतो निगूढाशयविशदीकरणार्थमविरतसन्तानार्थं चापि तज्ज्ञानं टीकाग्रन्थेष्वक्षरसंनिविष्टं क्रियत इत्यन्यदपि टीकाग्रन्थानां बीजम्। मूलग्रन्थापेक्षया तद्विवरणं जटिलतरमिति स्थितौ टीकायाष्टीका अपि टिप्पनीरूपेण प्रचुरतया लिखिताः सन्ति संस्कृतवाङ्मये। किन्तु कुत्रचिदेतद्दोषदुष्टमपि टीकावाङ्मयं प्रायो

मूलार्थस्य समीचीनबोधं कुर्वदास्त इत्युक्तौ न स्यात्प्रत्यवायः। ज्ञानव्यवस्थिति पदवाच्ये शास्त्रे पदवाक्यप्रमाणपराणि यानि भाषातत्त्वान्युपयुज्यन्ते, यानि च तेषु तेषु टीकाग्रन्थेष्वपि सामान्यतोऽनुसृतानि तानि निखिलवैदिकावैदिकदार्शनिकानां प्रायः सम्मतानि। एतेषां टीकादिगतानां समानभाषातत्त्वानां सङ्ग्रथनं व्यवस्थापनं वा पाश्चात्यैः 'Methodology' (पद्धतिविज्ञानम्, व्यवस्थितिशास्त्रम्) इत्यभिधीयते। एतत्पद्धतिविज्ञानं व्यवस्थितिशास्त्रं वा प्राचीनभारते प्रभिन्नशास्त्रद्वारा परिणतेः परां कोटिं गतम्। तथापि प्रभिन्नप्रस्थानेष्वपि समानभाषातत्त्वावलम्बविषयेऽविसंवाद एव वर्तते। प्रस्थानभेदमनुसरतामपि टीकाग्रन्थानामर्थविवृतिपरिपाटीषु भेदतोऽपि साधर्म्यमेव नयनसरणिमायाति। अत्र—

प्रभिन्ने प्रस्थाने परमिदमदः पथ्यमिति च।
रुचीनां वैचित्र्यादृजुकुटिलनानापथजुषां।

नृणां शब्दतत्त्वावलम्बी सूत्रभाष्यटीकामार्ग एक एव गम्य इति सुव्यक्तम्।

शब्दतत्त्वमाश्रित्य विशिष्टशास्त्रटीकालेखने यानि पदवाक्यप्रमाणपराणि सामान्यतत्त्वानि सन्दृब्धानि, यानि पुरतः संस्थाप्य च प्रभिन्नटीकाग्रन्थविरचनं पूर्वस्मिन् काले जातं, तानि सर्वाण्यपि विविधमौखिकाध्यापनरीतीनां निदर्शनानीत्यनुमातुं शक्यते। यतो भारतीयानां मौखिकाध्यापने यावती श्रद्धा न तावती लिखितपठने। विशेषतो वेदाध्ययने—

गीती शीघ्री शिरःकम्पी तथा लिखितपाठकः।
अनर्थज्ञोऽल्पकण्ठश्च षडेते पाठकाधमाः॥

इति वेदाङ्गशिक्षाप्रमाणाल्लिखितपाठकस्याधमत्वं, मौखिकाध्यापने गुरुमुखे वा भारतीयानां प्रभूतादरश्च प्राचीनकालात्प्रभृत्यद्य यावद् दृश्येते। किन्तु गुरुमुखं क्षरं, लिखितवाङ्मयं चाक्षरमिति सन्दृश्य भारतीयैर्मौखिकाध्यापेन विषयावबोधनरीत्या च यानि यानि तत्त्वान्यनुसृतानि तानि तान्येव काव्यशास्त्रटीकाग्रन्थरूपेण चिरस्थायित्वं प्रापितानीति टीकाग्रन्थगतप्रमाणैरेव निश्चेतुं शक्यम्।

पुरा प्रतिगृहं पिता पुत्रं गुरुः शिष्यं वा मुखतोऽध्यापयति स्म। एवमध्यापनस्य मौखिकत्वसामान्येऽपि प्रतिगुरु प्रभिन्नाऽध्यापनरीतिः

श्चेति ।......विध्यर्थवादोभयविलक्षणं तु वेदान्तवाक्यम् ।" (मधुसूदन-सरस्वतीकृतः 'प्रस्थानभेदः')

सर्वाण्येव ब्राह्मणानि मन्त्रविवरणव्याख्यानपराण्येवेत्यभिप्रायेण श्रीमच्छङ्कराचार्या बृहदारण्यकोपनिषद्भाष्ये "इतिहासः पुराणं विद्या उपनिषदः श्लोकाः सूत्राण्यनुव्याख्यानानि व्याख्यानान्यस्यैवैतानि निश्वसितानि" (बृ. २।४।१०) इति वचनमुद्दिश्य प्राहुः। यथा—

"इतिहास इत्युर्वशीपुरूरवसो संवादादिः 'उर्वशी हाप्सराः (शत० ब्रा० ११–४–४–१) इत्यादि ब्राह्मणमेव। पुराणम् 'असद्वा इदमग्र आसीत्' (तै. २।७) इत्यादि। विद्या देवजनविद्या (नृत्यगीतादि-शास्त्रम्) 'वेदः सोऽयम्' (शत. १३–४–३।१०–१४) इत्याद्या। उपनिषदः 'प्रियमित्येतदुपासीत' (बृ. ४–१–३) इत्याद्याः। श्लोका ब्राह्मणप्रभवा मन्त्राः 'तदेते श्लोकाः' (बृ. ४–३–११; ४–४–८) इत्यादयः। सूत्राणि वस्तुसङ्ग्रहवाक्यानि वेदे यथा 'आत्मेत्येवोपासीत' (बृ. १–४–७) इत्यादीनि। अनुव्याख्यानानि मन्त्रविवरणानि। व्याख्यानान्यर्थवादाः। अथवा वस्तुसङ्ग्रहवाक्यविवरणान्यनुव्याख्यानानि।...मन्त्रविवरणानि व्याख्यानानि। एवमष्टविधं ब्राह्मणम्॥"

विद्वत्परिषत्सु यज्ञतत्त्वमधिकृत्य सञ्जाताः संवादविवादा ब्राह्मणानां कर्मकाण्डे सङ्ग्रथिताः, येभ्यः पूर्वमीमांसाशास्त्रं परिवृद्धिं गतम्। तथा च परब्रह्मतत्त्वं पुरस्कृत्य परिषत्सु सम्भूताः संवादविवादा ब्राह्मणानामुपनिषत्संज्ञिते ब्रह्मकाण्डे (ज्ञानकाण्डे) सङ्कलिताः, यतश्चोत्तरमीमांसाशास्त्रं सुविस्तृतिमापन्नम्। उभयत्रापि पुराणेतिहासाद्यर्थवादरूपेण परिचितवस्तूदाहरणरूपेण चोपमानप्रमाणं प्राचुर्येणोपयुज्य, प्रत्यक्षप्रयोगावलम्बेन वस्तु प्रदर्श्य च गभीरविषयविवरणमुत्थाप्याकाङ्क्षापूर्वकं गुरुभिः प्रश्नप्रतिवचनभङ्ग्या विहितं संलक्ष्यते। उत्थिताकाङ्क्षापुरस्सरं प्रौढशिष्यैः पृष्टानां परिप्रश्नानां प्रतिवचनानि गुरुभिरुचितसमय एव व्याख्यानानुव्याख्यानतः प्रदेयानीत्यासीत्तदानीं मौखिकाध्यापनरीतिः। अत्रैव समुद्भूता प्रश्नोत्तरपद्धतिः संवादपद्धतिर्वा तदुत्तरभाविषु ग्रन्थेषु प्राधान्येन खण्डान्वयमुखेना समाश्रित दृश्यते। अतो या निर्वचनव्याख्यानपद्धतिः पूर्वं मुखत एव गुरुशिष्य-

परम्परया प्रचलिता, विद्वत्परिषन्निर्णयैश्च ध्रुवत्वं प्राप्ता सैव वेदोत्तरभाविषु ब्राह्मणग्रन्थेषु लेखनसंनिविष्टाऽभवदित्यवधारयितुं पार्यते।

यज्ञतत्त्वं मूर्धन्यीकृत्य वेदाङ्गषट्कस्योपन्निर्देशो ब्राह्मणानां कर्मकाण्डे कृतो विद्यते। सामवेदान्तर्गतब्राह्मणेषु प्राधान्येन पदं लेभिरे षडङ्गानि, यान्युत्तरवर्तिनि काले विविक्तत्वेन परिवृद्धिं जग्मुः। यथा मुण्डकोपनिषदि (१।१।५) तथा छान्दोग्येऽपि (७।१।२) वेदानां वेदः (व्याकरणम्), देवविद्या (निरुक्तम्), ब्रह्मविद्या (शिक्षाकल्पच्छन्दांसि), नक्षत्रविद्या (ज्यौतिषम्) इति शब्दान्तरेण वेदाङ्गानां निर्देशाज्ज्ञायते यदुपनिषत्काले तान्यपरिणतरूपेण मौखिकपरम्परया वाऽविद्यन्त एव। अन्यथा शिक्षानिरुक्तव्याकरणानामत्यन्ताभावे वेदानां स्वरस्थानप्रयत्नाद्यनपेतं साधूच्चारणम्, अर्थज्ञानं, संहितायाः पदपाठे पदपाठस्य संहितायां वा विपरिणमनं चेत्यादीनामसम्भवाद् वेदरक्षामार्गे महानेव व्याघातः समुदपत्स्यत।

ब्राह्मणान्युपनिषदश्चेत्युभयोरन्तरवर्तिनि काले शाकल्येन संहितायाः पदपाठः प्रतिष्ठापित इत्यनुमीयते। 'पदप्रकृतिः संहिता' (ऋक्प्रातिशाख्यम्, २।१) 'परः सन्निकर्षः संहिता' (पा. १।४।१०९) इति सूत्रानुसारेण संहितापाठे यथास्थितानामेव पदानां सन्धियुक्तमुच्चारणं, छन्दोनियमानतिक्रम्य विशिष्टस्वरवर्णोच्चारणं चानिवार्ये स्तः। पदपाठे तु मन्त्रपदानि विच्छेदनपुरस्सरं नियमैरेवोच्चार्यन्ते। अयं पदपाठः सन्धिसमासादिविग्रहपरो लौकिकसंस्कृतस्थस्य पदच्छेदरीतेः पूर्वतनं स्वरूपम्। एतदर्थं नामाख्यातोपसर्गनिपातानां चतुर्णां पदजातानां, सन्धिसमासानां च यज्ज्ञानमपेक्षितमासीत्तस्य गुरुमुखपरम्परयैव विद्यमानत्वात्पदपाठनिर्माणं सुशकमभवत्। एतदेव व्याकरणसनाथं साधूच्चारणशास्त्रं केनचित्कालेन शिक्षाग्रन्थेषु प्रातिशाख्येषु च संनिविष्टमभवत्। 'पदप्रकृतीनि सर्वचरणानां (शाखान्तराणां) पार्षदानि (प्रातिशाख्यानि)' इति महर्षियास्केन प्रातिशाख्यानां (वेदव्याकरणानां) स्वस्मात्पूर्वभावो निर्दिष्टः। तदानीं वेदवाङ्मयवृक्षस्य प्रभिन्नशाखानां विपुलविस्तारात्प्रतिवेदशाखं वैदिकव्याकरणरूपाणि प्रातिशाख्यानि प्रभिन्नानि जातानि। पदपाठविरचने वेदानां सम्यगर्थनिर्धारणमेव प्रयोजनम्। तदर्थं च समुत्पन्नानि शिक्षाव्याकरणनिरुक्तादी-

न्यर्थनिर्धारणसाधनानि वेदाङ्गत्वेन वेदव्याख्यानपराण्येवेत्यवगन्तव्यम्। वेदाङ्गानामुत्पत्तिविषये महर्षिर्यास्को ब्रूते यत्— "साक्षात्कृतधर्माण ऋषयो बभूवुः। तेऽवरेभ्योऽसाक्षात्कृतधर्मभ्य उपदेशेन मन्त्रान् सम्प्रादुः। उपदेशाय ग्लायन्तो (खिद्यमानाः) अवरे बिल्मग्रहणाय (सुखग्रहणाय विस्तरेण) इमं ग्रन्थं (निघण्टुं) समाम्नासिषुर्वेदं (वेदशाखाभेदान्) च वेदाङ्गानि च" (निरुक्तम् १।२०।२)। एवं शिक्षाव्याकरणादिवेदाङ्गानां सद्भावाद्गीर्वाणवाण्याः साधूच्चारणविषये दत्तसूक्ष्मावधानैः पूर्वतनाध्यापकैर्यथा तस्याः पावित्र्यमद्य यावत्परिपालितं, तथेदानीन्तनाध्यापकैरपि तत्परिपालनीयं साधूच्चारणाभ्यासेनेति संस्मरणीयः सिद्धान्तोऽत्र समुदेति।

प्रातिशाख्येषु प्रायः स्थानप्रयत्नविवेकः, संज्ञाः, सन्धयः, कुत्रचित्पदनिर्वचनं चेति विषया वेदभाषामधिकृत्य निरूपिताः, न तु कारकसमासतद्धितादिविषयाः, येऽविकलतया पाणिनीयसूत्रेषु स्थानमलभन्त। यन्निर्वचनं ब्राह्मणेषु प्रातिशाख्येषु च विरलत्वेनोपलभ्यते तस्य प्रपञ्चो यास्काचार्येण निघण्टुव्याख्यानपरे स्वीयनिरुक्तग्रन्थे कृतः। तेन 'आख्यातजानि नामानि' इति शाकटायनसिद्धान्तमुररीकृत्य 'तदिदं विद्यास्थानं (निरुक्तं) व्याकरणस्य कार्त्स्न्यं स्वार्थसाधकं च' (नि. १।१५।१) निर्मितम्। निर्वचनविषये शब्दचतुष्टयं स्वीकृत्य यास्कमहर्षिणा गुर्वर्थाः सिद्धान्ताः समुद्भाविताः। ते यथा—

"तद्येषु पदेषु स्वरसंस्कारौ समर्थौ प्रादेशिकेन गुणेन (धातुरूपेण) अन्वितौ स्यातां तथा तानि निर्ब्रूयात्। अथानन्वितेऽर्थेऽप्रादेशिके विकारेऽर्थनित्यः (अर्थप्रधानः) परीक्षेत केनचिद् वृत्तिसामान्येन (क्रियागुणसामान्येन)......नैकपदानि (प्रकरणोपपदरहितानि) निर्ब्रूयात् (निरु. अ. २, खं. १-३) इति।

अयं सिद्धान्तनिचयस्तदनन्तरभाविनः पाणिनेर्व्याकरणस्य प्रतिष्ठा, प्राचीनतमे काले समुद्भावितोऽप्याधुनिकभाषाशास्त्रविदां प्रमाणम्। आत्मनः पूर्ववर्तिनां नैरुक्तवैयाकरणयाज्ञिकैतिहासिकनैदानादीनां निर्देशो यास्काचार्येण निरुक्ते कृतः। तस्माद्वेदार्थविस्मरणेन ग्रन्थवैरल्येन च कृशीभूतोऽप्ययं वेदनिरुक्तिप्रवाहो गुरुमुखपरम्परयैव यास्कं यावदागत इति प्रतीयते।

अयमेव प्रवाहो यास्काचार्येण स्थिरीकृतो निरुक्ते प्रश्नप्रतिवचनरूपेणैव व्याख्यानेनेति सन्द्रष्टव्यम्। इयं प्रश्नप्रतिवचनरूपा व्याख्यानपद्धतिर्निरुक्त-व्याख्यातारं दुर्गाचार्यं यावदविरतं सम्प्रातेत्यपि तद्व्याख्यातः प्रतीयते।वेदार्थ-निर्णायकोऽयं निघण्टुनिरुक्तपन्था अमरादिकोशैरुत्तरवर्तिनि काले किञ्चित्परि-वर्तनपुरस्सरं विशिष्टपदसंहत्या क्षुण्णत्वं प्रापितः। प्रारम्भिकाध्यापनेऽनुपयुक्तेऽप्यस्मिन्निरुक्तिमार्गे, यास्कदुर्गादिभिरनुसृता प्रश्नप्रतिवचनरूपा व्याख्यानप-द्धतिर्वाङ्मयाध्यापने सुरुचिरेत्यत्र विज्ञातव्यम्। अपि च यास्काचार्यस्य बह्वर्थगम्भीरा सूत्रमयी भाषाऽनन्तरभाविनः सूत्रवाङ्मयस्य पूर्वरूपं व्यञ्जयति।

एतदनन्तरम्—

सरितामिव प्रवाहास्तुच्छाः प्रथमं यथोत्तरं विपुलाः।
ये शास्त्रसमारम्भा भवन्ति लोकस्य ते वन्द्याः॥ (काव्यमीमांसा)

इति न्यायेन वेदवाङ्मयस्य विभिन्नशाखाभिरपरिमेयव्यासः, वेदाङ्गज्ञानस्य मुखपरम्परया ग्रन्थपरम्परया चोपचयः, ग्रन्थप्रतिलिपीनां वैरल्यान्मौखिका-ध्ययने स्मृतिशक्तौ च महान् भार इत्येतेन कारणकदम्बकेन समासवचनरूपाः सूत्रग्रन्थाः समुद्भूता ज्ञानसन्ततये स्मृतिस्थापनसौकर्याय च। ज्ञानव्यवस्थितेः (शास्त्रदृष्टेः) ज्ञानसङ्क्रातिरीतेः (मौखिकाध्यापनपरिपाट्याः) च विशिष्टं प्राग्भावं विना, तत्तद्विषयपारदर्शित्वं विनायं व्याससमासयोः प्रथमोद्यमोऽसुकर एवाभविष्यत्। उक्तं च राजशेखरेण यथा—'समासव्यासविन्यासः सैष शिष्यहिताय नः' इति।

सूत्रग्रन्थानां शैली लघुविविक्तवाक्यभूयिष्ठानां ब्राह्मणनिरुक्तादि-ग्रन्थानां समुत्कृष्टस्वरूपमेव व्यञ्जयति। अक्षरलाघवार्थं गम्भीराभिप्रायस्य समासतो वचनेनैव सूत्रग्रन्थेषु प्रथमतः समासभूयस्त्वमुपलभ्यते, यदुत्तर-कालीने लौकिकसंस्कृतवाङ्मये ओजोगुणविशिष्टाया गौडीरीतेः प्राधान्येन व्यपदेशकरं सञ्जातम्। समासभूयस्त्वेन सममाख्यातलोपः सुबन्तप्राधान्यं चेत्यपि सूत्रग्रन्थशैल्या वैशिष्ट्यं, यदप्यनन्तरभाविनि संस्कृतवाङ्मये परां कोटिं गतम्। यत्प्रतनुसूत्रमिव सूत्रयति बध्नाति वाऽल्पाक्षरैः पदैरर्थं तदेव सूत्रम्। अक्षरलाघवे समासवचने चाप्यर्थगाम्भीर्यमर्थाप्रतीतिराहित्यमित्या-दयो गुणाः सूत्रेऽपेक्ष्यन्त एव। अतः सूत्रलक्षणमभियुक्तैरुक्तं यथा—

अल्पाक्षरमसन्दिग्धं सारवद्विश्वतोमुखम्।
अस्तोभमनवद्यं च सूत्रं सूत्रकृतो विदुः॥

स्मृतिसौलभ्यसम्पादनद्वारा विषयतात्पर्यसुग्रह एव सूत्रग्रन्थानां प्रयोजनम्। अत एव सूत्रशैली न केवलं वेदाङ्गेषु, यथोत्तरं वैदिकदर्शनेषु च, किन्त्ववैदिकदर्शनेष्वपि सामान्यत्वेन पदमधिगतवतीत्युपलभ्यमानैस्तत्तद्ग्रन्थैरेव निश्चीयते। प्रतिवेदशाखं प्रतिवेदाङ्गं प्रतिदर्शनं वा ये सूत्रग्रन्था इदानीमुपलभ्यन्ते, तेभ्योऽपि समधिकाः पूर्वं प्रणीता आसन्निति प्रतीयते, यतोऽनुपलब्धानां सूत्रग्रन्थानां प्रणेतारस्तत्तन्मतोपन्यासपूर्वकमुपलब्धसूत्रग्रन्थेषु नामतो निर्दिष्टाः सन्ति। समानविषयं पुरस्कृत्यापि बहवः सूत्रग्रन्थाः पूर्वतनैर्विद्वद्भिर्विरचिता भवेयुर्येषां संमतं विमतं च समालोच्य तदुत्तरतनैर्दोषवर्जमन्ये व्यापकसूत्रग्रन्थाः प्रणीताः, येन पूर्वतनसूत्रग्रन्था निष्प्रयोजनत्वाद्विस्मृतिपथं प्रयाता इति पाणिनिजैमिनिव्यासादिकृतसूत्रेभ्योऽनुमीयते। असमाने सत्यपि विषये दर्शने वा, प्रतिपक्षभूतदार्शनिक–विमतोपन्यासपूर्वकं स्वीयसिद्धान्तास्तत्तद्दार्शनिकैर्निजसूत्रेपूपस्थापिता इति समालोक्यते। एतेषु सिद्धान्तेषु केचिद्विद्वत्परिषत्सु प्रत्यक्षं सञ्जातानां संवादविवादानां मौखिकनिर्णया एव सूत्ररूपेण सङ्कलिता इत्युक्तिः प्रायो निर्बाधा स्यात्।

प्रतिशास्त्रं सूत्राणि यथाकालं यथावश्यं च समुद्भूतानि, किन्तु समुत्पद्यमानानां तेषां यः क्रमः पूर्वमासीत्स एवाद्य यावदचलरूपेणायात इति नैव कल्पयितुं पार्यते। सर्वेषां सूत्राणां प्रतिशास्त्रं सञ्जातेऽन्तिमे सङ्कलने विषयस्य तात्पर्यानुरोधेनाभिमतपूर्वोत्तरभावानुसारेण च स आदिमोऽनुक्रमः परिवर्तनं प्राप्य स्थिरीभूत इति प्रतीयते। यथाऽधुनातनलेखकस्य विमर्शविषयीभूतः कश्चित्प्रबन्ध आदौ विशिष्टक्रमेण प्रस्फुरत्यनन्तरं चाभिमतस्वरूपेण भिन्नक्रममधिगत्यान्तिमं ध्रुवाकारं प्राप्नोति तथैवेयं स्थितिः स्यात्। कालानुक्रमेण प्रतिशास्त्रं सूत्रसमुच्चयानां ज्ञेयविषयसङ्गत्यनुरोधेनाऽ[1]ध्यायपादा-

---

१ शास्त्रेऽध्याये तथा पादे न्यायसङ्गतयस्त्रिधा।
शास्त्रादिविषये ज्ञाते तत्तत्सङ्गतिरूह्यताम्॥

धिकरणादीन् विभागान् प्रकल्प्य पुनश्च प्रत्यधिकरणं[1] विषयसंशयपूर्वपक्ष-सिद्धान्तसङ्गतिरूपाणि पञ्चाङ्गानि संविभक्तानि तत्तच्छास्त्रविद्भिः, येन तत्तच्छास्त्रसमाविष्टं ज्ञानं तत्तद्विशिष्टपद्धतिसनाथं व्यवस्थितिं प्राप्तम्। मीमांसा-वेदान्तशास्त्रयोरेतज्ज्ञानव्यवस्थितिप्रधानं पद्धतिशास्त्रं परमां वृद्धिं लेभे। व्याकरणसूत्रव्यवस्थितिः प्रायोऽध्यायपादादिक्रमेणैव सञ्जाता, किन्तु तत्सूत्र-सङ्गतौ यद्वैशिष्ट्यमधिकरणस्थलेऽधिकारसूत्राणि विरच्य श्रीपाणिनिना प्रकल्पितं, तत्पृथक्तया विवेचनार्हं भवति।

यद्यपि सूत्रेषु तात्पर्यसुग्रहत्वं विद्यते, तथापि साङ्गोपाङ्गविवरण-द्वारा सम्यग्विषयावगमसमनन्तरमेव तात्पर्यावधारणं सुकरं, न तु सूत्र-पठनमात्रेण। तस्माद्बहुकालं यावत् तत्तद्विषयाध्यापकैर्मुखत एवं सविस्तरं विषयव्याख्यानं कार्यं, शिष्यैश्च तदविकलतयाऽऽकलय्य सूत्राणि कण्ठस्थी-कार्याणि, पुनश्च तैः शिष्यैः स्वशिष्या यथापूर्वमेव मौखिकव्याख्यानेना-ध्यापनीया इतीयं परम्पराऽविच्छेदेन चिरकालं प्रस्तुता स्यात्। यद्यप्यसन्दि-ग्धत्वमेव सूत्रस्य विशिष्टलक्षणं, तथाप्यल्पाक्षरत्वेनैव तत्प्रायः सन्दिग्धत्वं भजत इति सार्वजनीनोऽनुभवः। मुखतः सूत्रव्याख्यानेऽनुक्तानां पदानाम-ध्याहारः, उक्तपदानां च विग्रहयोजनापूर्वकं सकलसारभूतं सरलसुबोध-विवेचनमिति स्यात्पूर्वं मौखिकाध्यापनरीतिर्या केनचित्कालेन वृत्तिनामके टीकाप्रभेदेऽक्षरसंनिवेशं लेभे। अनुक्तपदप्रपूरणेन सूत्रार्थस्य च्छन्दोबद्धायां कारिकाया ग्रथनं स्मृतिसौकर्यार्थमेव सञ्जज्ञे। सूत्रमधिकृत्योक्तानुक्तदुरुक्त-चिन्तापरा गद्यरूपवृत्तेर्भिन्ना गद्यनिबद्धाश्छन्दोनिबद्धा वा वार्तिकग्रन्था-प्राय आदित एव ग्रन्थरूपेणावतीर्णाः स्युः, यतः सूत्रपाठे ग्रन्थरूपेण स्थिरी-भूत एव वार्तिकानामुत्पत्तिः सुशकेति भाति पाणिनीयसूत्राण्युद्दिश्य विर-चितेभ्यः कात्यायनवार्तिकेभ्यः। वृत्तिवार्तिकयोः सम्भवो भाष्यग्रन्थेभ्यः पूर्व-जात इति पातञ्जलमहाभाष्यनिर्दिष्टवार्तिकेभ्यः शाबरशाङ्करभाष्योल्लिखित-वृत्तिग्रन्थेभ्यश्च सम्भाव्यते। अपि च सूत्राणां सरलसुबोधव्याख्यानरूपाया मूलार्थमात्रग्राहिकाया गद्यवृत्तेरनन्तरं तेषामनुक्तदुरुक्तचिन्तापराणां वार्ति-कानां प्रवृत्तिस्तदुत्तरमेव पराक्षेपनिरासपुरःसरं भाष्यरूपेण मुखतो लेखतो वा

---

१ विषयो विशयश्चैव पूर्वपक्षस्तथोत्तरम्।
सङ्गतिश्चेति पञ्चाङ्गं शास्त्रेऽधिकरणं विदुः॥

व्याख्यानमित्यनेन नैसर्गिकक्रमेणैव व्याख्यानपद्धतिः परमां विस्तृतिं प्राप्ता। टीकाप्रभेदानामेतत्पौर्वापर्ये तु नियतमेवेति न मन्तव्यं, यतोऽनुकरणमात्रबुद्ध्याऽर्वाक्तनेऽपि काले सूत्रादिनिर्माणं नासम्भवम्। विशेषतोऽत्र समवधेयं यदुपनिषन्निरुक्तादिषु या प्रश्नप्रतिवचनपद्धतिः पूर्वमध्यापने समाश्रिताऽऽसीत्सैव सविशेषं पातञ्जलमहाभाष्ये शाबरभाष्ये चानुसृता दृश्यते। प्रत्यक्षतः पृष्टाः कल्पिता वा शिष्याणां सन्देहाः, प्रतिपक्षिणां पूर्वपक्षभूताः पुरत उपस्थापिताः सम्भाव्या वाऽऽक्षेपाश्च प्रश्नप्रणाल्या प्रागुक्तभाष्यद्वये सङ्ग्रथितास्तेषां प्रतिवचनानि च स्वसिद्धान्तरूपेण। या सूत्रव्याख्यानरीतिर्मौखिकाध्यापने गुरुभिः पूर्वं समाश्रिता तस्या एव लिखितरूपं निदर्शनमुत्तरभाविषु बृहदाकारेषु भाष्यग्रन्थेषु लभ्यते। एवं पाणिनिपतञ्जलिप्रभृतिभिर्वैयाकरणैः प्रदर्शिता पदव्याख्यानरीतिः, जैमिनिशबरस्वामिप्रभृतिभिर्मीमांसकैराविष्कृता वाक्यार्थनिर्णयरीतिः, गौतमादिनैयायिकैः प्रकटीकृता प्रमाणपरीक्षारीतिश्चेतीयं व्याख्यात्रिपथगा सुविमर्शजलसमृध्दया ज्ञानक्षेत्रं सत्यफलसम्पन्नमातन्वाना वैदिकावैदिकसकलदार्शनिकमान्या शिष्यजनोपकर्त्री च सञ्जज्ञे।

सूत्रनिर्माणकालात्पूर्वं यथा वेदार्थसाधनभूतानां षडङ्गानां तथा षड्दर्शनानामपि मौखिकी परम्पराऽविच्छिन्नाऽऽसीत्। अन्यथा षड्दर्शनसूत्राणां विरचनमसम्भवमभविष्यत्। यज्ञतत्त्वपुरस्कारेण ब्राह्मणादिग्रन्थैरुपबृंहितं धर्मशास्त्रोपकारि च यन्मीमांसाशास्त्रं तत्सूत्रकाले जैमिनिकृतन्यायसाहस्र्यां वेदार्थनिर्णयविषये सम्पूर्णतां परमं प्रामाण्यं चोपजग्मौ। 'न्याय'-शब्दोऽत्र न केवलं गौतमीयन्यायशास्त्रवाची, किन्तु लोकव्यवहारागमयुक्तिसिद्धन्यायवाच्यपि। एते जैमिनिसूत्रस्थिता मीमांसान्यायाः शब्दतत्त्वमग्रतो निधायार्थनिर्धारणे साधनभूताः सन्तो यथा धर्मशास्त्रनिर्णये तथा व्याकरणसूत्रनियोजनरीतौ परिभाषारूपेणापि परमोपकारकाः सञ्जज्ञिरे। एवं मीमांसाशास्त्रं न केवलं धर्मशास्त्रस्य, अपि तु व्याकरणाद्यन्यशास्त्राणामप्युपकारकं सम्भूतमित्यनुमीयते। गौतमकृतन्यायसूत्रात्पूर्वं तर्कशास्त्रम् 'आन्वीक्षिकी' इत्यभिधानेन लोकेषु मुखपरम्परया सुप्रचारं, चरकसंहितायां चाक्षरसंनिविष्टं जातम्। न्यायशास्त्रापरपर्यायैषाऽऽन्वीक्षिकी विद्या कौटिलीयार्थशास्त्रे—"हेतुभिरन्वीक्षमाणाऽऽन्वीक्षिकी लोकस्योपकरोति, व्यसनेऽभ्युदये च बुद्धिमवस्थापयति, प्रज्ञावाक्यक्रियावैशारद्यं च करोति—

प्रदीपः सर्वविद्यानामुपायः सर्वकर्मणाम्।
आश्रयः सर्वधर्माणां शश्वदान्वीक्षिकी मता॥"

इति यथार्थस्तुतिवाक्यैः समुत्कृष्टां ख्यातिं प्राप। एवं सूत्रनिर्माणकालात्पूर्वं तदनन्तरमपि षडङ्गेषु 'मुखं व्याकरणं स्मृतम्' इति शिक्षावचनानुसारेण व्याकरणं, षड्दर्शनेषु धर्मशास्त्रोपकारि पूर्वमीमांसाशास्त्रमुत्तरमीमांसाशास्त्रं च, तथा प्रमाणोपबृंहितं सर्वशास्त्रोपकारकं न्यायशास्त्रं चेति शास्त्रचतुष्टयं सविशेषं पाठ्यक्रमसमाविष्टं बभूव। परस्परोपकारित्वात्तानि सर्वाण्यपि शास्त्राणि कस्यचिदपि जनस्याध्ययने समकक्षत्वं समसंविभागं च भेजिरे। किन्त्वध्ययनानुक्रमे व्याकरणमेव मुखत्वेनादौ संमानं लेभे। यतः "प्रधानं च षट्स्वङ्गेषु व्याकरणम्। प्रधाने च कृतो यत्नः फलवान् भवति" (पात. म. भा. १।१)। तथा च 'काणादं पाणिनीयं च सर्वशास्त्रोपकारकम्' इत्युक्तिः काणादोपलक्षितन्यायशास्त्रसिद्धान्तानां पाणिनीयव्याकरणसिद्धान्तानां न केवलं व्यापकत्वं प्रकटयन्ति, किन्तु प्रायो निखिलवैदिकावैदिकदार्शनिकमान्यत्वमपि। यतः सत्स्वपि विभिन्नसम्प्रदायिषु व्याकरणेषु, वेदाङ्गत्वेन शिरोधार्यतां गतं पाणिनीयव्याकरणं बौद्धाद्यवैदिकदार्शनिकेष्वपि पाठ्यत्वेन प्रभूतादरभाजनमभवदिति 'इत्सिङ्ग–ह्युएन्त्सङ्ग'–प्रभृतिचीनयात्रिकाणां वृत्तान्तेभ्योऽवगम्यते। एवं तदानीं सत्यामपि तौलनिकज्ञानाधिगमप्रवृत्तौ, अनन्तरवर्तिनि काले 'द्वादशवर्षैर्व्याकरणं श्रूयते' (पञ्चतन्त्रम्) इत्यादीनि वचनानि परिवृत्तिं गतामध्ययनाध्यापनरीतिं ख्यापयन्ति। अतो नैतच्चित्रं यद्वेदाध्ययनापेक्षया वेदाङ्गैकाध्ययन एव प्रदीर्घं कालं यापयतां शिष्याणां मतिस्तौलनिकज्ञानापेक्षया शास्त्रैकदेशनैपुण्ये दर्शनैकदेशवैदग्ध्यसम्पादने वाऽधिकतरं व्यासक्तेति। तथापि पदवाक्यप्रमाणपराणां यथोत्तरं व्याकरणमीमांसान्यायशास्त्राणामन्योन्यपूरकत्वसिद्धये, शास्त्रदृष्टेः पूर्णत्वापादनाय च, अधिगतेऽपि व्याकरणादिविशिष्टशास्त्रस्य साङ्गोपाङ्गे ज्ञाने, मीमांसान्यायाद्यन्यशास्त्राणां स्थूलं ज्ञानं प्रत्येकं पण्डितेनाधिगन्तव्यमिति प्रणाल्यद्य यावद्भारते प्रचलिता दरीदृश्यते। यथा–सञ्जातेऽपि महाभाष्यान्तव्याकरणप्रावीण्ये,प्रत्येकं शास्त्रिप्रवरेण 'सिद्धान्तमुक्तावलि' यावन्न्यायशास्त्रस्य, 'मीमांसान्यायप्रकाशं' यावत्पूर्वमीमांसायाः, 'वेदान्तपरिभाषां' यावदुत्तरमीमांसायाश्च तौलनिक-

शास्त्रदृष्टिसम्पादकमध्ययनमवश्यं विधेयमिति विद्यते सम्प्रदायोऽद्यापि प्राचीनायां संस्कृताध्ययनाध्यापनपरिपाट्याम्। सत्यवकाश एतदधिक-शास्त्राणामप्यध्ययनं विधीयेत केनापि कुशाग्रमतिमता, किन्तु नायं सार्वत्रिको नियमः। उक्तमत्र विषये सुश्रुते यथा—

एकं शास्त्रमधीयानो न विद्याच्छास्त्रनिश्चयम्।
तस्माद्बहुश्रुतः शास्त्रं विजानीयाच्चिकित्सकः॥

एतैः पदवाक्यप्रमाणपरैः शास्त्रैः शब्दतत्त्वमधिकृत्याऽऽविष्कृतेष्वभि-प्रायेषु यथा वैमत्यं तथा समन्वयोऽपि परिलक्ष्यते। तत्समन्वयाधारेणाऽऽलङ्कारिकैः शब्दतत्त्वसङ्कलन साहित्यशास्त्रे कृत्वोत्तरतनगुरुशिष्याणां कृते काव्यपठनपाठनयोर्महती पदवी निर्मिता। एतेषां व्याकरणमीमांसान्यायादीनां प्रतिशास्त्रं शब्दतत्त्वानि, तेषां तत्त्वानां पूर्वोत्तरभाव गौणप्रधानभावं चाधि-कृत्य तत्र तत्रोपलभ्यमानं ज्ञानव्यवस्थितिपदवाच्यं प्रयोगप्रमुखं पद्धतिविज्ञानं, तेषां सकलानामपि समन्वयसाधनानीत्यादयो विषया अत्र परिगणनार्हाः, तेषां तत्त्वानामालङ्कारिकैर्विहितः समन्वयोप्यत्र संलक्ष्यः। किन्तु प्रकृत-प्रबन्धभूरिविस्तरभिया तत्कर्मणोऽत्र विरम्यते। अपि च तेषां तत्त्वानां पठनपाठनोपयुक्ताः केचिदंशाः "Oriental Methodology of Education" इत्यस्मदीयाऽऽङ्ग्लभाषागतप्रबन्धे समुपन्यस्ता इत्यतः पुनरुक्तिदोषोऽप्यत्र परिवर्ज्यते। आङ्ग्लभाषाभिज्ञैरुपर्युल्लिखितशब्दतत्त्वानि तस्मिन्नाङ्ग्ल-भाषागतप्रबन्ध एव नयनविषयीकर्तव्यानि। अत्र तु सङ्क्षेपार्थं समुपन्यस्यन्ते प्राचीने काले विद्वत्संसद्भिर्निर्णीताः, गुरुमुखपरम्परामार्गेणऽऽयाताः, पदवाक्य-प्रमाणपरा अत एव शब्दतत्त्वमवलम्बमानाः, शास्त्रव्यवस्थितिपदवाच्या अत एव तन्त्रयुक्त्यपराभिधानाः, गीर्वाणवाङ्मये लेखसंनिविष्टाः सर्वव्यापिन्योऽर्थनिर्धारणरीतयो, या न केवलमायुर्वेदार्थनिर्णयेऽर्थशास्त्रार्थनिश्चये, अपि तु सर्वशास्त्रार्थनियोजने सामान्यतः साधनभूताः सत्यः पौरस्त्यानां पद्धति-विज्ञानस्य पूर्वतनं स्वरूपं सुविशद प्रदर्शयन्ति। परिकल्पनीयमत्र यद् व्याकरणमीमांसान्यायादिशास्त्राणां समुपन्यासोचिता भाषातत्त्वविषयिणः सिद्धान्ता एतास्वर्थनिर्धारणरीतिरूपासु तन्त्रयुक्तिषु गतार्था इति, यतः शब्दतत्त्वावलम्बिन्य शास्त्रनययुक्तय एवात्र समासेनोपनिबद्धाः सन्ति।

भाषातत्त्वस्वरूपं द्विविधम्। प्रथमं भाषायास्तत्त्वज्ञानं (Theory), द्वितीयं च तस्याः प्रयोगविज्ञानम् (Practice)। प्रयोगविज्ञानमेव पद्धतिशास्त्रस्वरूपेणावतीर्णं सदभिज्ञजनानां क्रियाकौशलं विविधैः प्रकारैरभिव्यनक्ति। आदौ भाषायास्तत्त्वज्ञाने, भाषोत्पत्तेर्भाषाया बहिराविष्कृतेश्चाऽऽध्यात्मिकं व्यापारमनुसृत्य मूलगामितत्त्वानां सङ्कलनं समावेशमर्हति। अनन्तरं भाषायाः प्रयोगविज्ञाने भाषातत्त्वज्ञानं तथोपयोक्तव्यं, यथा भाषाध्ययनाध्यापनक्रमो बालानां बोधसौकर्याय रुचये च भवेत्। भाषायास्तत्त्वज्ञानं यथा पौरस्त्यानामाद्यग्रन्थेषु तदुत्तरकालीनेषु व्याकरणमीमांसान्यायशास्त्रेषु च, तथा भाषायाः प्रयोगविज्ञानमादौ मौखिकाध्यापने तदनु चार्थविवृतिपरेषु टीकाग्रन्थेषु, पदमलभत। टीकाग्रन्थेष्वपि कदाचिदुभयोर्भाषातत्त्वज्ञान-प्रयोगविज्ञानयोः, कदाचिच्च प्रयोगविज्ञानमात्रस्योपन्यासः क्रियते। अतः प्रयोगविज्ञानप्रधानं टीकावाङ्मयमेव पौरस्त्यानां पद्धतिशास्त्रस्याध्यापनपद्धतीनां च मूर्तिमन्निदर्शनमिति निश्चेतुं शक्यम्। अत्रोपस्थाप्यमानासु तन्त्रयुक्तिषु तु भाषायास्तत्त्वज्ञानं स्वयमन्तर्हितं भवत्प्रयोगविज्ञानमेव विस्पष्टमग्रतो निदधाति। एतास्तन्त्रयुक्तयष्टीकाग्रन्थेष्वप्यर्थविवृत्यर्थे समाश्रिताः सन्ति। भाषायास्तत्त्वज्ञानस्य प्रयोगविज्ञानरूपेण विपरिणमनं, गवेषणापूर्वकं प्राचीनाध्यापनपद्धतेर्निवेदनं, तदुचित-भागस्याधुनिकाध्यापने हितकारि नियोजनमित्येव विद्यतेऽत्रास्मदीयं मुख्यं प्रयोजनम्। अतष्टीकाकृद्वचनैसार्धं तास्तन्त्रयुक्तयो गुरुशिष्यजनोपकृतयेऽत्रोदाह्रियन्ते। तन्त्रं नाम शास्त्रं प्रयोगविज्ञानं वा। तस्मिञ्छास्त्रे प्रयोगविज्ञाने वा या अर्थसाधनरीतयो युज्यन्ते तास्तन्त्रयुक्तयः शास्त्रभूषणानि भवन्ति। उक्तमभियुक्तैस्तासां तन्त्रयुक्तीनां सर्वव्यापित्वं, यथा—

तन्त्रे समासव्यासोक्त्या भवन्त्येता हि कृत्स्नशः।
एकदेशेन दृष्ट्या तु समासाभिहितं यथा॥
एकस्मिन्नपि यस्येह शास्त्रे लब्धा सदा मतिः।
स शास्त्रमन्यदप्याशु युक्तिं ज्ञात्वा प्रबुध्यते॥
अधीयानोऽपि शास्त्राणि तन्त्रयुक्त्यविचक्षणः।
नाधिगच्छति शास्त्रार्थानर्थान् भाग्यक्षये यथा॥

दुर्गृहीतं क्षिणोत्येव शास्त्रं शस्त्रमिवाबुधम्।
सुगृहीतं तदेव ज्ञं शास्त्रं शस्त्रं च रक्षति ॥

द्विविधं प्रयोजनं तासां तन्त्रयुक्तीनाम्। वाक्ययोजनमर्थयोजनं चेति। "वाक्यस्यासम्बद्धस्य योजनं सम्बन्धनं वाक्ययोजनम्"। "लीनस्यासङ्गतस्य चार्थस्य प्रकाशनं सङ्गतीकरणं चार्थयोजनम्"। एतदर्थाश्चात्र श्लोकाः सन्ति—

असद्वादिप्रयुक्तानां वाक्यानां प्रतिषेधनम्।
स्ववाक्यसिद्धिरपि च क्रियते तन्त्रयुक्तिभिः ॥
व्यक्ता नोक्तास्तु ये ह्यर्था लीना ये चाप्यनिर्मलाः।
लेशोक्ता ये च केचित्स्युस्तेषां चापि प्रसाधनम् ॥
यथाम्बुजवनस्यार्कः प्रदीपो वेश्मनो यथा।
प्रबोधस्य प्रकाशार्थं तथा तन्त्रस्य युक्तयः ॥

एतास्तन्त्रयुक्तयः सुश्रुतसंहितायां कौटिलीयर्थशास्त्रे च द्वात्रिंशत्सङ्ख्याकाः, चरकसंहितायां षट्त्रिंशत्सङ्ख्याकाः, अन्यत्र च चत्वारिंशत्सङ्ख्याकाः परिगणिताः। चरकसंहितायां तासामुद्देशो यथा—

तत्राधिकरणं योगो हेत्वर्थोऽर्थः पदस्य च।
प्रदेशोद्देशनिर्देशवाक्यशेषाः प्रयोजनम् ॥
उपदेशापदेशातिदेशार्थापत्तिनिर्णयाः।
प्रसङ्गैकान्तनैकान्ताः सापवर्गो विपर्ययः ॥
पूर्वपक्षविधानानुमतव्याख्यानसंशयाः।
अतीतानागतावेक्षा-स्वसंज्ञोह्यसमुच्चयाः ॥
निदर्शनं निर्वचनं सन्नियोगो विकल्पनम्।
प्रत्युच्चारस्तथोद्धारः सम्भवस्तन्त्रयुक्तयः ॥

अत्र योगोद्देशनिर्देशादीनां वाक्ययोजनं प्रयोजनं, अधिकरणपदार्थोह्यादीनामर्थयोजनं च प्रयोजनम्। एतासां तन्त्रयुक्तीनां सोदाहरणानि लक्षणानि, यथा—

तन्त्रयुक्तयः।

१ अधिकरणम्—यमर्थमधिकृत्योच्यते (अपरेऽर्था अभिधीयन्ते) तदधिकरणम्।

२ योगः—येन वाक्यं युज्यते स (विपर्ययेणोक्तानां सन्निकृष्टपदानामेकीकरणं) योगः। वाक्ययोजना योगः (कौ. अ.)। दूरस्थानां व्यस्तानां वा पदानामेकीकरणं योगो योजना वा।

३ हेत्वर्थः—यदन्यदुक्तमन्यार्थसाधकमुभयार्थसाधकं वा भवति स हेत्वर्थः। हेतुरर्थसाधको हेत्वर्थः (कौटि. अर्थशास्त्रम् = कौ. अ.)।

४ पदार्थः—योऽर्थोऽभिहितः सूत्रे पदे वा स पदार्थः। पदस्य पदयोः पदानां वाऽर्थः पदार्थः। पद्यते गम्यते येन अर्थः इति सूत्रस्यापि पदत्वात्सूत्रे योऽर्थः प्रतिपादितः स पदार्थः। पदार्थस्त्वनेकस्तत्र योऽर्थः पूर्वापरयोगसिद्धः (पूर्वोक्तपरोक्तवाक्यसम्बन्धेनोपपन्नः) भवति सोऽर्थो ग्राह्यः। यथा-'वेदोत्पत्तिमध्यायं व्याख्यास्याम' इत्युक्ते सन्दिह्यते बुद्धिः—कतमस्य वेदस्यायमुत्पत्तिं विवक्षुरिति। यतः ऋग्वेदादयस्तु वेदाः। विद विचारणे विद्लृ लाभे इत्येतयोश्च धात्वोरनेकार्थयोः प्रयोगः। तत्र पूर्वापरयोगमुपलभ्य प्रतिपत्तिर्भवति 'आयुर्वेदोत्पत्तिमयं विवक्षुरिति एष पदार्थः'। पदावधिकः पदार्थः (कौ. अ.)।

५ (अ) प्रदेशः—प्रकृतस्यातिक्रान्तेन साधनं प्रदेशः। यद् बहुत्वादर्थस्य कार्त्स्न्येनाभिधातुमशक्यत्वादतिदेशेनाभिधीयते। अर्थानुपात्तैकदेशोऽयमुक्तः (चक्रपाणिः—चक्र.)। वक्तव्येन साधनं प्रदेशः (कौ. अ.)।

(आ) उपमानम्—दृष्टेनादृष्टस्य साधनमुपमानम् (कौ. अ.)।

६ उद्देशः—समासवचनं (संक्षेपेण भणनं) उद्देशः। यथा—सामान्यं च विशेषं च गुणान् द्रव्याणि कर्म च। समवायं च तज्ज्ञात्वा तन्त्रोक्तं विधिमास्थिताः। (गङ्गाधरः — गं.)। समासवाक्यमुद्देशः (कौ. अ.)।

७ निर्देशः—विस्तरवचनं निर्देशः। संक्षेपेणोक्तस्य विवरणं वा। (चक्र.)। व्यासवाक्यं निर्देशः (कौ. अ.)।

८ वाक्यशेषः—येन पदेनानुक्तेन वाक्यं परिसमाप्यते स वाक्यशेषः। यस्यार्थेन वाक्येषु यदगम्यमानतया पूर्तये पूरणं स वाक्यशेषः। यथा—प्रवृत्तिर्हेतुभावानामित्यत्र 'अस्ति' इति पदं पूर्यते। वाक्यवत् पदानि शेषाश्च क्रियन्ते येऽनिवेशिता अपि प्रतीयन्ते (चक्र.)। येन वाक्यं समाप्यते स वाक्यशेषः (कौ. अ.)।

* ९ प्रयोजनम्—यदर्थमारभ्यन्त आरम्भास्तत्प्रयोजनम् (गं.)। यदर्थं कामयमाना प्रवृत्तिस्तद् (चक्र.)।

१० उपदेशः— इदमेवं (कुर्यात्) इदं नैवमिति यदुच्यते।—तथा न जागृयाद्रात्रौ दिवा स्वप्नं च वर्जयेत्। उपदेशो नामाप्तानुशासनम्। अत्र प्रायिक उपदेशः। उपदेशो नियोगात् भिद्यते, यतो नियोगे व्यभिचारो नास्ति, अप्रायिकत्वादपरिहार्यत्वं विद्यते। यथा—पथ्यमेव भोक्तव्यमिति। एवं वर्तितव्यमित्युपदेशः (कौ. अ.)।

११ अपदेशः— अनेन कारणेनेदमिति (कार्यं प्रति हेतुकथनम्) अपदेशः। अपदेशो नाम यत् प्रतिज्ञातार्थसाधनाय हेतुवचनम्। तत्प्रतिज्ञातार्थस्य हेतुवचनं दुष्परिहरत्वादिति (चक्र.)। एवमसावाहेत्यपदेशः (कौ. अ.)।

१२ अतिदेशः— उक्तेन साधनमतिदेशः (कौ. अ.)। यत्प्रकृतस्यानागतेन (भविष्यता) साधनं अतिदेशः (गं.)। अतिदेशो नाम यत्किञ्चित्प्रकाश्यार्थमनुक्तार्थसाधनायैवमन्यदपि प्रत्येतव्यमिति परिभाष्यते। यथा—"यच्चान्यदपि किञ्चित्स्यादनुक्तमिह पूजितम्। पूर्णं तदपि वात्रेयः सदैवमनुमन्यते" (चक्र.)।

१३ अर्थापत्तिः—यत्र केनचिदर्थेनोक्तेन परस्यार्थस्यानुक्तस्य सिद्धिः (गं.)। अर्थापत्तिर्नाम यदकीर्तितम् (अप्रतिपादितम्) इति मत्वाऽर्थादापद्यते साऽर्थापत्तिः। यथा—'ओदनं भोक्ष्ये' इत्युक्तेऽर्थादापन्नं भवति—नायं पिपासुर्यवागूमिति। (चक्र.)। यदनुक्तमर्थादापद्यते सार्थापत्तिः (कौ. अ.)।

१४ निर्णयः (उत्तरपक्षः)— यत्पूर्वपक्षस्योत्तरवचनं स निर्णयः (गं.)। निर्णयो नाम विचारितस्यार्थस्य व्यवस्थापनम्। (चक्र.)। तस्य (पूर्वपक्षस्य) निर्णयनवाक्यमुत्तरपक्षो वा (कौ. अ.)।

१५ प्रसङ्गः— यत्प्रकारान्तरेण समापनं स प्रसङ्गः, यद्वा प्रकरणान्तरितो योऽर्थोऽसकृदुक्तः समाप्यते स प्रसङ्गः (गं.)। प्रसङ्गो नाम पूर्वाभिहितस्यार्थस्य प्रकरणगतत्वात्पुनरभिधानम् । (चक्र.) । प्रकरणान्तरेण समानोऽर्थः प्रसङ्गः (कौ. अ.) ।

१६ एकान्तः— सर्वत्र यदवधारणेन (अविकल्पेन, नियमेन) उच्यते स एकान्तः । उदाहरणेऽवधारणवाचिन एवकारस्य निर्देशात् । अवधारणं विधेयायोगव्यवच्छेदः । तथा च पार्थ एव सर्वोत्कृष्टधनुर्धर इति पार्थे सर्वोत्कृष्टधनुर्धरत्वायोगव्यवच्छेदेनैकान्तः । सर्वत्रायत्तमेकान्तः (कौ. अ.) ।

१७ नैकान्तः (अनेकान्तः)—क्वचित्तथा क्वचिदन्यथेति यः सोऽनेकान्तः । क्वचित्सजातीये तथा क्वचिदन्यथेति । यथा—सन्ति ह्येके प्रत्यक्षपराः परोक्षत्वात् पुनर्भवस्य नास्तिक्यमाश्रिताः, सन्ति चापरे आगमप्रत्ययादेव पुनर्भवमिच्छन्तीति (गं.)। नैकान्तः पुनरत्युग्रशब्दात् सर्वगो न चेदित्यादिनान्यतरपक्षावधारणम् (चक्र.) ।

१८ अपवर्गः—अभिप्लुतव्यपकर्षणमपवर्गः (कौ. अ.) । यदभिव्याप्यापकर्षणं सोऽपवर्गः (गं.)। साकल्येनोद्दिष्टस्यैकदेशापकर्षणम् । गुणक्रियादिभिः सर्वतो वाऽभिव्याप्य कस्यचित्पदार्थस्य तेभ्यो गुणक्रियादिभ्यः पृथक्करणमपवर्गः । यथा—सर्वमम्लं पित्तकरमन्यत्र दाडिमामलकात् ।

१९ विपर्ययः—यद्यत्राभिहितं तस्य प्रातिलोम्यं (विपरीतं ग्रहणम्) विपर्ययः। विपर्ययेण विपरीतमेव गम्यते, अर्थापत्त्याऽविपरीत एव अर्थः प्रतीयत इत्यनयोर्भेदः । यथा—कृशाल्पप्राणभीरवो दुश्चिकित्स्या इत्युक्ते विपरीतं गृह्यते दृढादयः सुचिकित्स्या इति। प्रतिलोमेन साधनं विपर्ययः (कौ. अ.) ।

२० पूर्वपक्षः—आक्षेपपूर्वकः प्रश्नः पूर्वपक्षः (गं.) । पूर्वपक्षो नाम प्रतिज्ञातार्थवाक्यार्थसन्दूषकं वाक्यम् (चक्र.)। प्रतिषेद्धव्यं वाक्यं पूर्वपक्षः (कौ. अ.)।

२१ विधानम्—प्रकरणानुपूर्व्याऽभिहितं विधानम् (गं.)। केचित्तु प्रकरणानुपूर्वार्थाभिधानं विधानमाहुः (चक्र.)। शास्त्रस्य प्रकरणानुपूर्वी विधानम् (कौ. अ.)।

२२ अनुमतम्–यत्परमतमप्रतिषिध्योच्यते तदनुमतम्। यथा–तत्रातीन्द्रियं पुनर्मनः सत्त्वसंज्ञकं चेत इत्याहुरेके (गं.)। अनुमतं नाम सह एकीयमतस्यानिवारणेनानुमननम् (चक्र.)। परवाक्यमप्रतिषिद्धमनुमतम्। (कौ. अ.)।

२३ व्याख्यानम्–अतिशयवर्णना व्याख्यानम् (कौ. अ.)। यदतिशयेन वर्णनं (ख्यापनं) तद् व्याख्यानम् (गं.)। व्याख्यानं नाम यत्सर्वबुद्धिविषयं व्याक्रियते, यथा–"प्रथमे मासि संमूर्च्छितः सर्वधातुकलुषीकृतः खेटभूतो भवत्यव्यक्तविग्रहः" इत्यादिना वाक्यस्य विदितार्थस्य व्याकरणम्।

२४ संशयः–उभयतो हेतुमानर्थः संशयः (कौ. अ.)। उभयहेतुदर्शनं संशयः। उभयोर्विसदृशयोरर्थयोर्हेतुस्तस्य दर्शनम्। यथा–इतश्च्युताः पुनर्भविष्यामो न वेति संशयः, कस्मात्? सन्ति ह्येके प्रत्यक्षपराः परोक्षत्वात् पुनर्भवस्य नास्तिक्यमाश्रिताः, सन्ति चापरे आगमप्रत्ययादेव पुनर्भवमिच्छन्तीति (गं.)। विशेषाकाङ्क्षावारितोभयविषयज्ञानं वा संशयः (चक्र.)। संशयो नाम सन्दिग्धेष्वर्थेष्वनिश्चयः (गं.)।

२५ अतीतावेक्षा (अतिक्रान्तावेक्षणम्)–यत्पूर्वमुक्तं तदतिक्रान्तस्यातीतस्य पुनरवेक्षणम्। पुरस्तादेवं विहितमित्यतिक्रान्तावेक्षणम् (कौ. अ.)।

२६ अनागतावेक्षा (अनागतावेक्षणम्)–यदेवं वक्ष्यतीत्यवेक्ष्यते तदनागतावेक्षणम् (गं.)। यदनागतं (भविष्यन्तं) विधिं प्रमाणीकृत्यार्थसाधनम् (कार्यार्थमवलोकनम्) (चक्र.)। पश्चादेवं विहितमित्यनागतावेक्षणम् (कौ. अ.)।

२७ स्वसंज्ञा–या न शास्त्रान्तरसामान्या सा स्वसंज्ञा (गं.)। सुश्रुते च–अन्यशास्त्रासामान्या स्वसंज्ञा। अन्यानि शास्त्राणि व्याकरणादीनि, तेषु असामान्या–असाधारणा, तत्राननुगता स्वशास्त्रेष्वेव प्रयोजनवतीत्यर्थः (डल्हणः– ड.)। या तन्त्रकारैर्व्यवहारार्थं संज्ञा क्रियते सा (चक्र.)। परैरसमितः शब्दः स्वसंज्ञा (कौ. अ.)।

२८ ऊह्यम्–यदनिर्दिष्टं बुद्धिमता बुद्ध्याऽवगम्यते तदूह्यम् (सुश्रुतम्–सु.)। ऊहो नाम पदनिबन्धग्रन्थे प्रज्ञया तर्क्यत्वेनोपदेश्यते, यथा–'यदुक्तमप्यनुक्तं सत् तदेत्यत्रापकर्षयेत्' इत्यादि (चक्र.)। बुद्धिगम्यमूह्यम् (ड.)। अनुक्तकरमूह्यम् (कौ. अ.)।

२९ समुच्चयः–यदिदं चेदं चेत्युच्यते स समुच्चयः (गं.)। यदादितदन्ते 'च' कृत्वा विधीयते, यथा–वर्णश्च स्वरश्चेत्यादि (चक्र.)। अनेन चानेन चेति समुच्चयः (कौ. अ.)।

३० निदर्शनम्–यत्र दृष्टान्तेनार्थप्रसाधनं तन्निदर्शनम्। सुश्रुते च-दृष्टान्तेनार्थः प्रसाध्यते यत्र तन्निदर्शनम्। अत एव च निदर्शनात् हेत्वर्थो भिद्यते, हेत्वर्थस्य दृष्टान्तमात्रत्वात् (गं.)। निदर्शनं नाम मूर्खविदुषां बुद्धिसाम्यविषयो दृष्टान्तः (चक्र.)। दृष्टान्तो दृष्टान्तयुक्तो निदर्शनम् (कौ. अ.)।

३१ निर्वचनम्– यन्निश्चितमुच्यते तन्निर्वचनम्। यथा–आयुर्वेदयतीति, आयुर्विद्यतेऽस्मिन्ननेन वा, आयुर्विन्दतीत्यायुर्वेद इति (गं.)। निर्वचनं नाम पण्डितबुद्धिगम्यो दृष्टान्तः, यथा 'ज्ञायते नित्यगस्यैव कालस्यात्ययकारणम्'। निदर्शननिर्वचनयोरयं विशेषो यत् निदर्शनं मूर्खविदुषां बुद्धिसाम्यविषयो दृष्टान्तः। निर्वचनं तु पण्डितबुद्धिवेद्यमेव। किं वा निर्वचनं निरुक्तिर्यथा–'विविधं सर्पति यतो विसर्पस्तेन संज्ञितः' इत्यादि (चक्र.)। गुणतः शब्दनिष्पत्तिर्निर्वचनम् (कौ. अ.)।

३२ सन्नियोगः (नियोगः)–यदिदमेव कार्यं, नेदं कार्यमित्येवं प्रेरणं नियोगः। यथा–मात्राशी स्यात्; यथा च देवगोब्राह्मणगुरुवृद्धसिद्धाचार्यानर्चयेदित्येवमादिः (गं.)। अवश्यानुष्ठेयतया विधानम् (चक्र.)। एवं नान्यथेति नियोगः (कौ. अ.)।

३३ विकल्पनं (विकल्पः)–यत्र वेति विशेषेण कल्प्यते तत्। यथा–मद्यमल्पं न वा पेयमथ वा सुबहूदकमिति। सुश्रुते च–इदं वेदं वेति विकल्पः (गं.)। प्रत्येकं वाशब्दोपादानमत्रोदाहरणे यत्र कृतं तदेकेनापि वाशब्देन बहुषु विकल्पतादर्शनार्थम्। क्वचिद्वाशब्दं विनाऽपि विकल्पो

भवति (ड.)। विकल्पः पाक्षिकाभिधानम् (चक्र.)। अनेन वानेन वेति विकल्पः (कौ. अ.)।

*३४ प्रत्युच्चारः—यत्पूर्वमुच्चरितं पुनस्तथैवोच्चार्यते (गं.)। प्रत्युच्चारो नाम परनिवारणम् (चक्र.)।

*३५ उद्धारः—यदुपदिष्टार्थमनुसृत्योद्धार्यते (गं.)। उद्धारो नाम परपक्षदूषणं दत्वा स्वपक्षोद्धारणं वा (चक्र.)।

*३६ सम्भवः—यो यतः सम्भवति स तस्य सम्भवः। यथा—दोषा व्याधीनां सम्भवः (गं.)। यद् यस्मिन् उपपद्यते स तस्य सम्भवो वा। यथा—मुखे व्यङ्गनीलिकादयः सम्भवन्तीत्यादि (चक्र.)।

[* एतच्चिह्नाङ्किता युक्तयः सुश्रुतसंहितायां कौटिलीयार्थशास्त्रे च न सन्ति।]

"भट्टारहरिश्चन्द्रेण चतस्रस्तन्त्रयुक्तयः परिप्रश्नव्याकरणव्युत्क्रान्ताभिधानहेत्वाख्या व्याहृताः। ताश्चैतास्वेव (षट्त्रिंशत्स्वेव) अन्तर्भावनीयाः। तत्र परिप्रश्न उद्देशेऽन्तर्भवति, व्याकरणं तु व्याख्याने। व्युत्क्रान्ताभिधानं निर्देशभेदः। हेतुशब्देन यानि प्रत्यक्षादीनि प्रमाणानि [न्यायशास्त्रे] उक्तानि तानि हेतावन्तर्भवन्ति।" (चक्र०)

एवं 'तन्त्र–(शास्त्र)–सारगवेषणे सम्यग्विनिहिताः', 'शब्दार्थन्यायसंयुताः', 'दीपीभूताः' तन्त्रयुक्तयः पदवाक्यप्रमाणजिज्ञासुभिर्विधिवद्वेदितव्याः। यद्यप्येताः सामान्यतो निखिलशास्त्रव्रातार्थनियोजनेऽतितरामुपयुक्तास्तथापि विशिष्टशास्त्रार्थावधारणे विशिष्टयुक्तीनामुपयोजनं मतिमद्योजकाधीनमेव। पुरातने काले यथा मौखिकाध्यापने, तथाऽर्थविवृतिपरे लिखिताध्यापनरूपे वा टीकावाङ्मयेऽप्येतासामुपयोजनं विशिष्टशास्त्रार्थविनिश्चयाय सङ्ख्यावद्भिरनुष्ठितपूर्वमेव। अतोऽधुनातनाध्यापनेऽप्यध्याप्यमानविशिष्टविषयसन्दर्भानुसारेणोपरितनतन्त्रयुक्तीनां यथासम्भवमुपयोजनं टीकावाङ्मयानुशीलनपूर्वकं विधेयमिति नैव पृथङ् निवेदनीयं प्रेक्षावज्जनेभ्यः। अनेनैवाभिप्रायेण सुश्रुते लिखितं, यथा—

सामान्यदर्शनेनासां व्यवस्था सम्प्रदर्शिता।
विशेषस्तु यथायोगमुपधार्यो विपश्चिता॥ इति।

इत्थं शक्तिग्रहोपायभूताया विवृतेः सुरभारतीवाङ्मयोदधौ महत्त्वं समवबुध्यैव तद्विषये विस्तरतो व्याख्यानमत्र विहितम्।

(८) सिद्धपदसांनिध्यम्—प्रसिद्धपदस्य सानिध्यमित्यष्टमः शक्तिग्रहोपायः। "प्रसिद्धपदस्य सानिध्यादपि शक्तिग्रहो यथा—'इह सहकारतरौ मधुरं पिको रौति' इत्यादौ पिकशब्दस्य मधुरादिप्रसिद्धपदसांनिध्यात् कोकिले शक्तिग्रहः" (सिद्धान्तमुक्तावलिः)। प्रसिद्धपदसानिध्यं सानिध्यमात्रात्किञ्चिद्भिद्यते, तथापि सांनिध्यपदोच्चारणेनात्र वाक्यान्वयसाधनभूतं संनिधि—तत्त्वं स्मृतिसरणिमायाति, संनिधिश्चात्र मीमांसकैकदेशिभिरभिहितान्वयवादिभिरुपदिष्टानामाकाङ्क्षा – योग्यता –संनिधीना वाक्यांशभूतपदान्वयोपयोगिनामुपलक्षणं भवति। आकाङ्क्षा–योग्यता–संनिधयश्च पुनः पदान्वयपुरस्सरं दण्डान्वयमुखेन, खण्डान्वयमुखेन वा वाक्यप्रकरणाद्यर्थमवगमयन्ति, ततो तात्पर्यवृत्त्या वाक्यमहावाक्यग्रन्थादिबोधाय क्रमशः सहायीभवन्तीति भाषातत्त्वान्यत्र सविशेष स्मृतौ संस्थाप्यानि।

उपसंहारः।

एवमवस्थितमिदं प्रतीच्यदृष्ट्यवलम्ब्यपि प्राच्यभाषातत्त्वाधिष्ठितमभिनवं शक्तिग्रहोपायविवेचनम्। प्रतीच्यदृष्ट्यवलम्बस्तु प्राच्यप्रतीच्यभाषातत्त्वसमन्वयाय तदनन्तरं च भाषाध्ययनाध्यापनयोः प्रयोगविज्ञानसौकर्याय कृतः, न तु पाश्चात्यदृष्टेः श्रेयस्त्वसाधनायेति विज्ञातव्यं प्रेक्षावद्भिः। यतः कस्यचिद्वङ्गीयविदुषो वचनानुरोधतः—

पाश्चात्यविदुषां नाहमृणी तद्ग्रन्थकर्षणात्।
यदस्मत्प्राक्तनेभ्यस्तैर्गृहीतर्णं विशुध्यते॥

इति रीत्या प्राच्यतत्त्वान्येवास्माकं जीवातुभूतानि। अत्राष्टशक्तिग्रहोपायेषु व्याकरणव्यवहारविवृतयोऽन्येभ्यः शक्तिग्रहोपायेभ्यो विस्तृततरं विमर्शविषयं गताः, अधुनातनभाषाध्यापनेऽपि तत्तन्माहात्म्यस्य चिरस्थायित्वात्। आदौ तावद् व्याकरणं विस्तरेण विमर्शविषयीभूतम्। यद्यपि प्राच्यैर्व्याकरणं मुखत्वेनाङ्गीकृतं, तथापि गीर्वाणभाषापरिवृत्त्यनुरोधेन तस्मिन् सुबन्तकारकसमासादीनां प्राधान्यं कथमवतीर्णं, प्रकृतिप्रत्ययविच्छेदनपूर्विका

तिङन्तप्रधाना यौगिकी च पदरूपसिद्धिः क्रमेण कथं गौणत्वं प्राप्ता इत्येव व्याकरणविमर्शे प्रदर्शितम् । व्याकरणाध्यापने तु व्यावहारिकं प्रयोजनं प्रधानपदं भजते । सामान्यच्छात्रदृष्ट्या यौगिकार्थं बोधयत्प्रकृतिप्रत्ययादिविशिष्टं व्याकरणं प्रायो वाङ्मयाध्ययने निष्प्रयोजनं भवति, अपि च रूढार्थं बोधयतां सिद्धपदानां कारकसमासादिसम्बन्धमाविष्कुर्वद् व्याकरणं मनोव्यापाराधिष्ठितं सद् गीर्वाणभाषापरिवृत्त्यनुसारेण वाङ्मयबोधाय पर्याप्तमित्ययं शास्त्रिप्रवरैरेवानुसृतः सिद्धान्तोऽत्राग्रे स्थापितः । अवधेयमत्र यन्मीमांसकैः विनियोगविधिविवेचने श्रुति-लिङ्ग-वाक्य-प्रकरण-स्थान-समाख्येत्येतेषां षट्प्रमाणानामुत्तरोत्तरं दुर्बलत्वं प्रस्थापितमिति । तेन समाख्यायाः (यौगिकार्थस्य) वाक्यार्थनिर्णये दुर्बलत्वं व्यक्तीभवति, 'लिङ्ग'स्य-रूढार्थस्यैव बलीयस्त्वं निर्णीत भवति च । अयं सिद्धान्तो वाक्यघटितवाङ्मयार्थनिर्णये गुरुभिः सामान्यच्छात्राणां कृते सर्वदैव पुरतः स्थापनीयः । व्याकरणाध्यापने च तात्त्विकीं दृष्टिं परित्यज्य व्यावहारिकी दृष्टिः समाश्रयणीयेत्येव व्याकरणविमर्शसारः ।

अनन्तरमस्मिन् शक्तिग्रहविवेचने व्यवहारस्य प्राधान्यं सविशेषं प्रतिष्ठापितं, यतः प्रतीच्यभाषातत्त्वविद इव प्राच्यभाषातत्त्वज्ञा अपि मनोविज्ञानाधिष्ठितस्य 'व्यवहार'स्य सर्वमूर्धन्यत्वं 'शक्तिग्राहकशिरोमणित्वं' वा समकण्ठघोषमेव प्रख्यापयन्ति । अत्रैव प्रतीच्यानां संवादपद्धतेर्व्यवहारेण साकं साम्यं संलक्ष्यते, न किञ्चिदप्यत्र प्रतीच्येभ्यः प्राच्यैर्नूतनमध्यापनतत्त्वमधिगन्तव्यमिति सुष्ठु दृष्टं स्यात् ।

तदनु विवृतिविमर्शोऽस्मिन्प्रबन्धेऽन्यशक्तिग्रहोपायेभ्योऽप्यधिकतरां विस्तृतिं प्राप्तः । विवृतेर्निदर्शनं टीकापदवाच्यलिखितव्याख्यानरूपेण गीर्वाणवाङ्मये भृशं लभ्यते । पुरा समीचीनव्याख्यातारोऽध्यापकाः किंलक्षणा आसंस्तथा तेषां मौखिकव्याख्यानरीतिः कियद्विधा प्रचलिता, के तस्या गुणविशेषाः, ते विशेषाः पुनरद्यत्वे शास्त्रिप्रवराणां मौखिकव्याख्याने (अध्यापने) कियदंशेनाधिगम्यन्ते, व्याख्यानपद्धतेः कान्यधिष्ठानभूतानि भाषातत्त्वानि, तानि भाषातत्त्वानि समवलम्ब्य ते ते व्याख्यानगुणा यथा बालानां तथा प्रौढानामधुनातनाध्यापनेऽपि कथं सम्पादनीया इति सर्वमधि

विवृतिविमर्शे सुविज्ञातं भवेत् । एतत्सर्वं ज्ञानं च गुरुशिष्यमतिं टीकावाङ्मयानुशीलने नियोजयेत् । तथा हि 'आत्मसंस्था क्रिया', 'सङ्क्रान्ति' श्चेति पुरातनाध्यापकानां गुणद्वयं यथा कालिदासेन मालविकाग्निमित्रनाटके परिगणितं तथा सुश्रुतेऽपि व्याख्यातुरायुर्वेदाध्यापकस्योभयज्ञत्वं (शास्त्रज्ञत्वं तथा कर्मज्ञत्वं) मतिमत्त्वम् (ऊहापोहक्षमत्वं) चेति गुणाः कथिताः ते यथा—

यस्तूभयज्ञो मतिमान् स समर्थोऽर्थसाधने ।
आहवे कर्म निर्वोढुं द्विचक्रः स्यन्दनो यथा ॥ इति ।

ईदृग्गुणसम्पन्नेन गुरुणा पुनः शिष्याणां पुरतो मुखतो व्याख्यानं कथमनुष्ठेयमित्यत्र विषये सुश्रुते वचनानि यथा—

"अथ वत्स ! तदेतदध्येयं यथा तथोपधारय मया प्रोच्यमानम्—अथ शुचये कृतोत्तरासङ्गाय (गृहीतोत्तरीयवस्त्राय) अव्याकुलाय (एकचित्ताय) उपस्थितायाध्ययनकाले शिष्याय यथाशक्ति (शिष्यस्य शक्त्यनतिक्रमेण, ग्रहणसामर्थ्यानुकूल्येन) गुरुरुपदिशेत् पदं (स्वाद्यन्तं त्याद्यन्तं वा), पादं (श्लोकचतुर्थांशं), श्लोकं (चतुष्पादपरिपूर्णं) वा । ते च पदपादश्लोका भूयः क्रमेणानुसन्धेयाः [तथा हि—पदेन पादः, पदपादाभ्यां श्लोकः सन्धानीयः] । एवमेकैकशो घटयेदात्मना चानुपठेत् [एकमेकं प्रति शिष्यं योजनिकां कारयेत्, शिष्यस्य पश्चादाचार्यः स्वयं पठेत्, शिष्यस्य सुखपठनार्थम्] । अद्रुतमविलम्बितमविशङ्कितमननुनासिकं व्यक्ताक्षरमपीडितवर्णं (वर्णमपीडयन्) अक्षिभ्रुवौष्ठहस्तैरनभिनीतं सुसंस्कृतं नात्युच्चैर्नातिनीचैश्च स्वरैः पठेत्" ॥ इति ।

इयं व्याख्यानपद्धतिष्टीकाग्रन्थगताया दण्डान्वयपद्धतेर्मौलिकमाद्यस्वरूपमित्यत्र विज्ञेयम् । दण्डान्वये नैयायिकमतानुसारेण वाक्यगतं कर्तृपदमादौ गृहीत्वा तदनुक्रमेण वाक्यस्थपदान्वयपूर्वकमर्थविवृतिः क्रियते । इयमेव रीतिरुपर्युपस्थापिता । खण्डान्वयपद्धतिस्त्वत्र न वर्णिता । प्राचीनकालादारभ्याद्य यावत्पातञ्जलशाबरादिभाष्यशैल्यनुरोधेन परिवृद्धिं गता प्रश्नोत्तरपद्धतिरेव 'किमो रूपं पुरस्कृत्य' खण्डान्वयरूपेणाचरतनटीका-

अन्येष्ववतीर्णा। अस्यां पद्धत्यां मीमांसकरीत्या क्रियापदमादौ गृहीत्वा तदनु कारकानुरोधेनोत्थिताकाङ्क्षाद्वारोत्थाप्याकाङ्क्षाद्वारैव वाक्यस्थानामवशिष्ट-पदानामन्वयविवृती क्रियेते। 'व्यवहार'-सहकृतैषा खण्डान्वय-पद्धतिः प्रतीच्यानां संवादपद्धतेः सुतरां साधर्म्यमापन्ना, बाल-प्रौढानामध्यापनेऽद्यत्वेपि परमहितकारित्वादनुसरणयोग्येत्ययं विषयोऽत्र संस्मरणीयः।

इदं व्याख्यानपद्धतिद्वयं गुरुणा किमर्थमनुविधेयम? तर्हि "चतुर्भिः प्रकारैर्विद्योपयुक्ता भवति—आगमकालेन स्वाध्यायकालेन प्रवचनकालेन व्यवहारकालेन" इति (पात. म. भा.)। तथा च "अधिगतमप्य-ध्ययनमप्रभाषितमर्थतः (अर्थतोऽव्याख्यातम्) खरस्य चन्दनभार इव केवलपरिश्रमकरं भवति। भवति चात्र—

यथा खरश्चन्दनभारवाही भारस्य वेत्ता न तु चन्दनस्य।

एवं हि शास्त्राणि बहून्यधीत्य चार्थेषु मूढाः खरवद्वहन्ति॥—"

तस्माज्ज्ञानस्याविरतपरम्परासंरक्षणाय शिष्यप्रशिष्यानुक्रमेण तदुपरितनरीत्या मौखिकाध्यापनरूपेण लेखगताध्यापनरूपेण (विवृतिटीकादिभिः) सततं व्याख्येयमन्यथा तदसफलप्रयोजनं भवतीत्यर्थोऽत्र साकल्येन समुदेति। ज्ञानवायुःक्रमे ज्ञानमादौ मुखनिविष्टव्याख्यानद्वारा तदनु च लेखनिविष्ट-व्याख्यानद्वारा सुस्थिरं भवति। यद्वा क्षरं मुखव्याख्यानमेव लिखितव्याख्या-नरूपेणाविर्भूयाक्षरविग्रहवद्भवति। अतो विवृतिव्याख्यानप्रभाषणप्रवचना-द्यपरपर्यायाष्टीकाग्रन्थाः पूर्वतनमौखिकाध्यापनरीतीनां निदर्शनानि भूत्वा तद्गतगुणगवेषणायोत्तरतनाध्यापनपद्धते रुचिरत्वापादनाय च कल्पन्ते। एतदर्थमेव शक्तिग्रहोपायभूता विवृतिरत्र सविस्तरं व्याख्याता।

अपि च प्रधानभूतायां विवृतावन्ये सर्वेऽपि शक्तिग्रहोपाया गौणत्वं भजमानाः स्वस्वस्थानमधिगत्य चरितार्था भवन्ति। तथा हि—सर्वशास्त्रो-पकारकं व्याकरणं धातुप्रकृतिप्रत्ययविच्छेदनविशिष्टया पदसाधनिकारूपया च स्वीयपदार्थज्ञानरीत्या यथा मौखिकव्याख्यानस्य तथा लिखितव्याख्यान-स्याप्युपकुरुते। तथा च प्रतिपाद्यविषयस्य चारुत्वमापादयदुपस्थानं, व्याकरणवद्धस्तोऽमरादिकृतपङ्क्तिभिरवतारितश्च कोशः, प्राक्तनाभियुक्त-

ग्रन्थकृद्वचनोध्दाररूपमाप्तवाक्यं, मनोव्यापाराधिष्ठितो वाक्योपयोजनपूर्वकश्च भाषाव्यवहारः, पदवाक्यांशप्रपूरको वाक्यशेषः, वाक्यगताप्रसिद्धपदावगमे समर्थं सिद्धपदसांनिध्यं चेति सर्वेपि सप्तशक्तिग्रहोपाया मौखिक–लिखित–विवृतौ यथाप्रसङ्गं पदं लब्ध्वा कृतार्थीभवन्तीत्यतो विवृतेरेव सर्वाधिकं माहात्म्यं मर्मविदां प्रतीतिविषयमियात् ।

पुनश्चेमे शक्तिग्रहोपायाः पदवाक्यप्रमाणज्ञानां वैयाकरणमीमांसकनैयायिकानामपि सर्वतः संमताः, तत्तद्दार्शनिकस्य तत्तच्छक्तिग्रहोपायस्य चान्योन्योपकारित्वात् । भवतु नाम प्रतिदर्शनं प्रमाणसङ्ख्यातारतम्यम्, प्रत्यक्षानुमानोपमानशब्दविशिष्टस्य प्रमाणचतुष्टयस्य ग्राह्यत्वविषये प्राय उपरितनदार्शनिकत्रयस्यैकमत्यं संलक्ष्यते । सर्वेषामपि शक्तिग्रहोपायानां प्रमाणचतुष्टयसंबद्धत्वं तावदित्थं दृष्टिगोचरीभवति । व्यवहाररूपः शक्तिग्रहोपायः प्रत्यक्षानुमानप्रमाणयोर्निदर्शनं विद्यते, यतो व्यवहारे सम्भाषणश्रवणावलोकनादिप्रधानं प्रत्यक्षप्रमाणमन्वयव्यतिरेकात्मकमनुमानप्रमाणं चेत्युभे समकालमेवोपयुज्यमाने सार्थतां गच्छतः । वैयाकरणाः पुनः पदसाधने नैयायिकानामन्वयव्यतिरेकपद्धत्या सनाथीकृता एवोत्सर्गापवादरीत्यवलम्बेन स्वसिद्धान्तसमुत्कर्षविधाने समर्थाः सञ्जाताः । स्फोटवादिनो वैयाकरणा यद्यप्यखण्डवाक्यस्फोटमेव मुख्यं मन्यन्ते, तथापि ते 'उपेयप्रतिपत्त्यर्था उपाया अव्यवस्थिताः ।' इति सञ्चिन्त्य पुनरपि—

"उपायाः शिक्षमाणानां बालानामुपलालनाः ।
असत्ये वर्त्मनि स्थित्वा ततः सत्यं समीहते ॥" (वाक्यपदीयम्) ।

इति न्यायेन शब्दतत्त्वस्य काल्पनिकं नामाख्यातोपसर्गनिपातादिविभागमुररीकृत्य नैरुक्तमार्गोन्मुखा सन्तः पदसंस्कारं विधातुमुत्सहन्ते । अपि च वैयाकरणाः सुबर्थनिश्चये वैशेषिकाणां सप्तपदार्थानङ्गीकुर्वन्ति । एवं व्याकरणशास्त्रं कोशसहकृतमत एव पदबोधकं तथा न्यायवैशेषिकोपबृंहितं सत् सर्वेषामुपकाराय समुद्यतते । अध्यापनस्य मनोविनोदकत्वं सम्पादयदुपमानप्रमाणं तावच्छक्तिग्रहोपायेषु विस्पष्टतयैवोपन्यस्तम् । चतुर्थं शब्दप्रमाणं प्रायः सकलैरपि शक्तिग्रहोपायैः सम्बद्धं विद्यते । तत्र च विशेषेणाऽऽप्तवाक्य–व्यवहार–वाक्यशेष – सिद्धपदसांनिध्यादयः शक्तिग्रहोपायाः पुरोगामित्वेन शब्दप्रामाण्यं स्वीकुर्वतां वाक्यार्थनिर्णयरतानां

मीमांसकानां शाब्दबोधपद्धतिं प्रदर्शयन्ति । तद्यथा-आप्तवाक्यं तु शब्दप्रमाणमेव । व्यवहारः पुनर्मीमांसकैकदेशिभिरन्विताभिधानवादिभिर्वाक्यबोधपुरस्सरपदबोध्यत्वेन सकण्ठरवमुद्घोषितः । अभिहितान्वयवादिमीमांसकाना मतं च पदबोधपुरस्सरं वाक्यार्थे पर्यवस्यतोर्वाक्यशेषसिद्धिपदसांनिध्यरूपयोः शक्तिग्रहोपाययोर्निलीनमिति प्रतीयते ।

इत्थं सप्तशक्तिग्रहोपायाः सर्वसारग्राहिण्यां विवृतावन्तर्भूय प्रमाणचतुष्टयबलेन तां द्रढयन्ति । अत्र टीकावाङ्मयान्तर्हितं पौरस्त्यानां भाषाध्ययनाध्यापनविषयकं पद्धतिशास्त्रमेवाऽऽविष्कृतमस्माभिः । नात्र मन्तव्यं यदखिलमपि विवृतिवाङ्मयं मूलग्रन्थापेक्षि परतन्त्रं चेति । पराक्षेपनिरासपूर्वकं स्वोपज्ञमतं विस्तारयन्तो भाष्यग्रन्था, तत्सदृशा अन्ये वा रसादिसमीक्षापरा टीकाप्रबन्धा मूलग्रन्थमाहात्म्यमेवाऽऽपन्ना मूलग्रन्था इवाभ्यसनार्हाः सञ्जाता इत्यत्र विषये निदर्शनोपन्यासो नापेक्ष्यते । ज्ञानाप्रधान्ये ज्ञानसातत्ये च सविशेषं दृग्विषयीकृते, 'अयं मूलग्रन्थः' 'अयं टीकाग्रन्थः' इति भेदो नैव नयनसरणिमायाति । तथापि मूलग्रन्थमहत्त्वाधायको मूलप्रतिबिम्बरूपः सरलसुबोधो विषयविस्तारो, मूलार्थस्यैव सामीचीन्येन प्रतिपादनं बोधनं वा टीकाग्रन्थानां मुख्यं प्रयोजनम् । अतष्टीकावाङ्मयानुशीलनमधुनातनगीर्वाणभाषाध्यापनेऽपि मूलग्रन्थस्य विषयरहस्यं सम्यगवबोध्य च्छात्राणां सत्यज्ञानरुचिं संवर्ध्य च भाषाज्ञानस्य दृढपरिपाकायापि कल्पेत । अद्यतनाऽऽङ्ग्लभाषागतटीकाटिपण्यादिभ्योऽपि संस्कृतटीकानुशीलनमसंशयमधिकतरं बोधमुत्पादयेदिति नैव विस्मरणीयम् । एवं सप्तशक्तिग्रहोपायभूतैः स्रोतोभिः परिपूरिता, पदवाक्यप्रमाणरूपाभिस्तिसृभिस्तरङ्गिणीभिश्च परिवर्धितेयं विवृतिमन्दाकिनी गीर्वाणवाङ्मयप्रदेशेऽद्ययावदविरत वहन्ती गभीरज्ञानोदधिजलसङ्गमेन कृतार्था सञ्जाता । अतो गुरुशिष्यास्तस्याः कूलमध्यास्य मूलग्रन्थैः साकं तस्या मधुरं जलमाकण्ठं संसेव्य च पूतचित्ता जायेरन्, विवृतिवाङ्मयं तद्बोधकमत्रत्यं पद्धतिशास्त्रं चेत्येतयोरनुशीलनेन सुरभारत्याः साङ्गोपाङ्गं ज्ञानमधिगम्य सन्ततं तस्याः सार्वाशिकाय समुत्कर्षाय प्रयतेरंश्चेत्याशास्य विरम्यते ॥

—×—

The Problem of Sanskrit Teaching

[संस्कृतानुशीलनविवेकः ।]

Part II

THE CLASSICS *versus* THE MODERN SUBJECTS

The value of a classical language like Sanskrit as an aid to culture is unquestionable; but its immediate utilitarian value for serving the daily needs of life is seriously questioned by persons of a practical bent of mind. Psychological investigations have again acknowledged " Individual Differences " and pointed out that an average pupil constituting the majority has less aptitude for a classical language than for practical subjects like handwork, drawing, carpentry etc. Nay, a vast majority of pupils have been found to have a very weak linguistic ability; i. e. they have no aptitude even for learning a modern language like French, English, German, etc.. Hence it is suggested by some that a highly inflected classical language like Sanskrit, should, on account of its inherent difficulty, be either dropped altogether from the curriculum or be made optional. On the other hand, the advocates of classical learning are trying their utmost to maintain the position of Sanskrit as a compulsory subject for all. A big controversy was raised over this problem in the West, and the advocates of modern subjects have won in the end. Thus in the Western countries the classical languages are gradually receding from the curriculum, and are studied only by a chosen few who have an aptitude for them. The same thoughts are echoed by those

Indian educationists who in imitation of the Westerners, have changed the University curriculum first by making the classical languages optional and then by combining the classical and modern languages under *one* head. It is interesting to note here how the *Classicists* and the Modernists, the two parties in the West as well as in India try to defend their own position and refute the view of the other party by putting forth various arguments.

When the *Classicists* maintain that acquaintance with the fundamentals of ancient culture enshrined in the classical languages is the *sine qua non* of complete education, the *Modernists* answer that the study of modern literature alone will suffice, since the same ancient culture has been absorbed in the modern languages. If again, any one is more interested in that culture, he should read the translations of the classical works.

The *Classicists* reply to this argument by asserting that the first-hand knowledge and intimate appreciation of the master-minds of old can in no way be compared to the second-hand knowledge from translations. Translation can never be an adequate substitute for the original. Though the subjectmatter of a literary work is in some way translatable, the enchanting manner or the unique style of a particular author is untranslatable. Prose rather than poetry is, perhaps, translatable, though with partial loss of the original beauty. Nobody, therefore, would rest satisfied unless he drank deep at the original fountain.

The *Modernists* argue against this that the immediate needs of the present must be looked to,

and that the study of modern sciences and training in citizenship are more useful than the classics.

The *Classicists* refute this argument by stating that the present has no meaning apart from the past and the future. As the present is ever linked to the past and the future, there must be continuity in the experiences of the three.

It can further be added that there need be no hostility between the modern sciences and the classics, since science exists in the forms of medicine, chemistry, astronomy, mathematics, architecture, logic, grammar, etymology, politics, economics, law, etc., even in Sanskrit. Modern sciences need not sever their connection with the ancient ones if the latter are even now useful in their own way and supply data for further research. Here, those Indians who deprecate ancient sciences and advocate the utilitarian value of modern sciences to the detriment of the classics should be asked to consider how much of modern science they have been able to collect under the present educational system, and whether that amount of knowledge has proved adequate to the solution of the difficult problem of the daily bread. They must know that the ideas of citizenship, politics and law are found embedded in the स्मृतिs, the अर्थशास्त्र of कौटिल्य and the महाभारत, all of which are indispensable for the comparative study of those subjects as treated of in modern works. Moreover, the study of Medicine (आयुर्वेद), Law (धर्मशास्त्र), Politics (नीतिशास्त्र), etc., the utilitarian value of which is indisputable even at present, is calculated to be more fruitful, if all of them are studied through Sanskrit. The study of the Hindu Law, as it is

carried on in the Law Course in a roundabout manner through English translations, not only entails much loss of energy on the part of the students, but gives them vague impressions, unless they try to understand the Hindu outlook and the import of original words in Sanskrit works.

Again, some classicists basing their arguments on the Faculty Psychology maintain that the classics provide a better mental gymnastic than the other subjects do; that the various faculties of the mind, viz., memory, attention, reasoning, observation, etc., are well trained by exercises in translation, rules for the formation of nouns and verbs in grammar, and rote-learning.

The *modern psychologists* prove the hollowness of this theory of "mental training", "formal training", "transfer of training" or "intellectual discipline", as it is variously designated. The Faculty Psychology which has lost sight of the necessary unity of the mind by treating the various aspects or functions of the same mind as separate faculties, but which holds its sway over common people, has been discredited by modern psychologists. The underlying principle of this theory of "Transfer of training" is that if a man exercises a specific faculty in a specific way, he develops the power of that faculty *in general*, i. e. for any kind of mental activity. For instance, if the verbal or rote memory is exercised, the power of memory in general is developed. In other words, the specific training in rote memory can be transferred to the other activities of memory in a wider sphere. But there are various functions of the general memory, as "verbal memory", "true memory" (memory for a series of ideas) etc., and Thorndyke

has experimentally proved that no transference of the one to the other is possible. If a man has developed his 'verbal-mechanical-rote' memory, there is no evidence to say that this activity is transferable to the functions of "true memory," which depends upon the understanding of relations and interest.

The same can be said of other faculties such as observation, attention, reasoning, etc.. We have no adequate ground to say that careful observation of grammatical forms in a classical language like Sanskrit will make a pupil more observant in general. For, observation also depends upon understanding and interest. We observe only such things as matter to us-as interest us. In translation a pupil has to think out, sometimes by inference, the accurate meaning of words in a sentence. We cannot, however, say with certainty that he will use this sense of "accuracy" in other departments of knowledge where he is not required to translate. Training in reasoning, which the process of translation is supposed to bring about, is also a specific training in the choice of words and in the observance of the rules of syntax; and it cannot be transferred to the forms of true reasoning which proceeds from cause to effect. There are various types of reasoning and only a specific reasoning power is developed instead of the general one in translation. True reasoning is developed by the study of logic and reading of books in the mother tongue rather than by the classical studies. Accuracy, reasoning, attention, observation, memory, etc., can be developed by several other subjects besides the classics. Again, attention which is forced and without interest does not result in any kind of fruitful work;

but intellectual effort coupled with feeling and interest is bound to lead one to success. Thus Experimental Psychology has demonstrated the futility of the theory of "mental gymnastic" or "intellectual discipline." The modern psychologists admit, however, that a slight transference is possible in cases where there are identical elements, allied languages or subjects, common content, or correlation of studies. With full faith in this theory of "intellectual discipline" some classicists lay stress on the formal rather than on the functional study of grammar, which becomes a drudgery to the pupils of tender age. If the training thus received is, as indicated above, specific, the theory of "intellectual discipline" cannot be said to stand on a firm footing.

Although the psychological truth of the foregoing argument be avowed, we find discrepancy in its advocacy of the study of logic instead of the classics for the development of "reasoning". Whatever might be the case of Western Logic, we think that the study of Indian Logic cannot be properly conducted except through Sanskrit. In spite of the existence of vernacular and English translations of some Sanskrit manuals of logic, the same Sanskrit logical terms have to be used in explanation, and ultimately, if any portions of the original manual can be translated into the mother tongue or English, they are only the Sanskrit inflections and a few minor words. We shall have thus to acknowledge the fact that the knowledge of Sanskrit is indispensable for the proper understanding and study of Indian Logic at least. Even the best translations of Sanskrit works on Logic do not much enlighten us, unless we approach the original, for

the understanding of which the knowledge of Sanskrit has to be presupposed. In short, logic cannot be divorced from Sanskrit.

The *classicists* again maintain on the basis of the theory of "Intellectual Discipline" that the very difficulty of the classics is a valuable aid to the training of the mind. The harder a subject, the closer the attention that has to be paid to it, and the longer is it remembered.

The *modern psychologists* say here that even after realising the inherent difficulty of Sanskrit, the formal study of its grammar in the initial stage can on no account be defended; and that no person can be forced to attend to a difficult subject, unless that subject matters to him–interests him. Solution of a difficulty or a problem interests a pupil, if there is proper motivation or the placing of a worthy aim before him. The humanistic aspect of language-study places a worthy aim before young pupils rather than the formal one. Moreover, a difficulty, if it is really worthy of solution, awakens intrinsic interest and further leads one to spontaneous work and progress; but it must be distinguished from bewilderment which is due to the inherent dryness of a subject and leads one nowhere. This makes quite clear that the incessant grinding at grammatical forms in the absence of a worthy goal–the enjoyment of literature–is bound to create disgust in the minds of juvenile students. Of course, it is partially true that every subject is difficult in the beginning, that enforced attention to it is *occasionally necessary, and that intrinsic* interest in it can be aroused gradually and not all at once. It is also true that some time in the beginning has to be devoted to the mastering of the

fundamentals of language before pupils come into touch with rich ideas in literature. Yet there is no reason why this mastering of fundamentals alone should be continued for years together and why ideas in literature should not be introduced side by side with the formal study of language. The benefits of studying Sanskrit, according to the present system, can be had only at an advanced stage. Pupils of tender age, therefore, cannot but grow impatient, when the study of literature is unnecessarily postponed by an indefinite period, and when they are made to plod their weary way over non-essential grammatical technicalities as preparatory to the future joy.

The *classicists* again affirm that the classics have stood the test of time and that nothing but the best has to be studied in them. On the other hand, modern literature is full of trash from which it is difficult to select a work of considerable merit.

The *modernists* retort against this by stating that the ancient literature is narrow in its outlook and not varied or wide like the modern one. The ancient authors did not even dream of the engaging problems and questions discussed in modern literature, and those problems are of more direct interest and use to us. If again, modern literature is full of trash, ancient literature is not devoid of it.

We must admit here that Sanskrit literature is not without a little trash; yet we cannot say that it is not varied. When the European Sanskritists have ungrudgingly acknowledged the variety of Sanskrit literature in thought and form and also its substantial contribution to the various departments of knowledge, the modernists simply betray their ignorance of Sanskrit in underrating it as narrow in out-

look. The present day problems are, no doubt, of more direct interest to us; yet it is unjust to say that none of them was dreamt of in ancient times. If history repeats itself, and if human nature is everywhere the same, we need not doubt that at least some of the present day problems once held the attention of ancient people in a different form. Is it not then desirable to seek solutions of the modern problems in similar situations or thoughts as recorded in ancient literature? Would it then be wise on our part to ignore Sanskrit literature which is our national heritage?

The *modernists* still declare that the classics are after all dead languages. 'None will be the loser for being ignorant of them.' On account of their inherent difficulty there is a very small return in proportion to the time and energy wasted over their study.

The *classicists* object to this assertion and say that the terms 'dead' and 'living' are relative. Generally the languages that have ceased to be spoken are termed as 'dead'; and this might be true in the case of Greek and Latin. This false analogy is not applicable to Sanskrit, which is not so dead to the Hindus as Greek and Latin are to the Europeans. In the first place, Sanskrit was once a spoken language and is still the language of our sacraments. Secondly, Sanskrit Pundits of the different parts of India are even now found to converse, write works and conduct periodicals in *Sanskrit* on varied subjects. Thirdly, a considerable number of poor students deprived of the benefits of English education are still studying Sanskrit alone in Pathashalas and Sanskrit Colleges scattered over all parts of India. They are further

availing themselves of the Oriental Title Examinations conducted by the Government and the bodies of Pundits *through the medium of Sanskrit,* and are solving the problem of the daily bread in their own way. Is it not then far from being true to call Sanskrit 'dead' and 'useless'? If it be objected that this activity is limited only to a small field, can we not say the same in the case of English education? When the percentage of literacy in India does not exceed 9, how small must be the number of people knowing English? Is it then wrong to say that affairs conducted in English, notwithstanding the spread of English education, are limited only to the English-knowing Indians who have been alienated from the vast population of India? Is not then English relatively dead to the masses? Even in the case of educated people we may state that English is not so 'living' to them as it is to the English people, it being their mother tongue. Generally the literary form of English is known by educated Indians rather than the colloquial one, which is known only by those that have lived in England. Moreover, taking into account the number of periods consumed by English in the time-table of educational institutions, the number of years devoted to its study and the surrender value of that study, no one can affirm that Sanskrit is more difficult than English. If the utilitarian value of Sanskrit is questioned, then we may ask: What is the market value of English education received at so great a cost? Does it bring returns adequate to the time, money and energy we spend over it? Of course, the international importance of the English language as a means of keeping oneself in touch with world affairs and of enriching modern

Indian literatures with new material cannot be disowned; yet it should occupy an equal number of periods in the time-table with Sanskrit or any second language and the mother tongue.

Sanskrit, not being a foreign language like English or a dead language like Greek and Latin to Indians, can be more easily learned by them than English, since many of the modern Indian languages have been derived from or influenced by Sanskrit, since they contain about a half of their words directly taken (तत्सम) or derived (तद्भव) from Sanskrit, and since their structure also mostly depends on that of Sanskrit Moreover, to suit our present needs we are coining continuously from Sanskrit new तत्सम words and technical terms to be made current in our mother tongue. Are we not then in a way treating Sanskrit as a 'living' language, though only in the case of isolated words? If one would minutely observe the characteristics of modern Indian Languages, one would not fail to note the tendency in them to be more and more Sanskritised. When Hindus are so much drawing upon the immortal store of Sanskrit as regards their mother tongues and culture, they at least cannot afford to be without a modicum of it. Of course, the supposed difficulty of Sanskrit can be removed by improving the methods of its teaching and bringing concreteness and the human touch in its study. The study of Sanskrit thus not only helps the intelligent grasp of the mother tongue, but is also indispensable for the correct and refined expression in the tongue and for etymological insight into words in the higher stages of the study. The ear of a classical scholar is keenly sensitive to the real meanings and subtle shades of words and sentences.

The study of the classics, therefore, is especially beneficial to literary aspirants and journalists in the mother tongue.

The *modernists* doubt the truth of this statement and add that a close study of authors in the mother tongue alone would make one proficient in it. Preferably an etymological turn may be given to the study of the mother tongue, for which no detailed study of Sanskrit is required.

The *classicists* refute this argument by advocating the urgent necessity of possessing the knowledge of Sanskrit at least upto the Matriculation Examination for learning well the mother tongue, the Prakrits or any modern Indian language like Hindi, Bengali, etc , since all of them depend more or less upon Sanskrit as regards their vocabulary and structure.To deny the claims of even this minimum of Sanskrit for the study of languages derived from Sanskrit is to build an edifice on sands. The separation of the mother tongue from Sanskrit by offering the former as an option for the latter,or the combination of both under one head in the school stage,as the University of Bombay has several times capriciously done, is a suicidal policy, which not only does an injustice to Sanskrit, but results in the desultory knowledge even of the mother tongue, to which the incorrect Marathi written by the present graduates and journalists will testify.The writer knows from his own experience that students knowing Sanskrit write more correct Marathi than those studying Marathi to the exclusion of Sanskrit. He has, moreover, noticed that some modern Marathi authors, who had been deprived of the benefits of learning Sanskrit, had ever by their side Sanskrit dictionaries for looking up apt words to be used in their Marathi

writings, but who, being ignorant of the suitability and context of those words in the Sanskrit language, sometimes used, due to this dictionary habit, such words as would be obscure even to Sanskritists! It should further be noted that certain ancient authors use a high percentage of Sanskrit words in their works in the mother tongue, and cannot be understood and appreciated well unless a minimum amount of Sanskrit is known. All these facts will prove beyond doubt the necessity of knowing, at least, as much of Sanskrit as should be known by a Matriculate

Etymological study of the mother tongue cannot be relished by students unless they are equipped with this amount of the knowledge of Sanskrit. In other words, the etymological aspect of language-study which in the main splits words into their components (प्रकृति and प्रत्यय) is an analytical process likely to disgust young pupils whose study of language must first be synthetic and then analytic. To explain further, ready-made forms of words as they occur in language should, for a few first years, be treated as independent words and learned in their synthetic form, attention being concentrated on the ideas in the language. Occasional reference to the etymology of particular words may be made gradually according to the growing understanding of pupils; yet too big a dose of etymology in the initial stage is sure to retard the progress of students. When the etymological teaching of Sanskrit is abhorred even by young pupils taking Sanskrit, it need hardly be added how much boring it would be to students ignorant of Sanskrit. Really speaking, the etymological study of language is suited only to the advanced stage and may be

commenced with advantage in the senior years of college education, when etymological interest is likely to grow among students. This remark may also apply to the study of the Prakrits which provide us with a valuable clue to the etymological and historical development of the mother tongue. But unless there is sufficient grounding in Sanskrit upto the matriculation standard, neither the advanced study of the mother tongue nor that of the Prakrits is likely to thrive

The *modernists*, nevertheless, contend that the present curriculum of the Indian Universities is predominantly linguistic and that three languages, the mother tongue, English and a classical language being required to be studied, none can be mastered. They further add that the pressing demand of Hindi as a national language must be supplied by prescribing it in the curriculum, and that Sanskrit should make room for it. According to them the mother tongue, English and Hindi, being utilitarian subjects, must be compulsory; but a classical language like Sanskrit, which has no utility and does not help the study of the mother tongue, should be banished from the curriculum, so that more time can be devoted to the mother tongue, the neglect of which has seriously affected the study of English.

The *classicists* maintain that the curriculum of the Faculty of Arts in the Universities of any country is bound to be predominantly linguistic; that is to say, it is generally found to make provisions for three languages, viz., the mother tongue, a modern foreign language and a classical language. If none of these languages can be mastered, the fault lies in the educational policy and the methods of teaching employed. Why then crowd this curriculum

with technical subjects, which should find sufficient scope in special institutes or other Faculties? Furthermore, the utilitarian value of English has already been discussed above and there are no two opinions as to the importance of the mother tongue. If the neglect of the mother tongue is said to affect the teaching of a foreign language like English, it is really hard to understand how, according to the modernists, the study of Sanskrit does not help the study of the mother tongue which is closely related to it! It can be affirmed here that the systematic study of the mother tongue in the primary and secondary stages not only prepares the pupils for the introduction of Sanskrit and facilitates its study, but is, in return, substantially assisted by the growing knowledge of Sanskrit.

If Sanskrit is not a utilitarian subject, the utilitarianism, as meant by the modernists, is nothing less than the 'Bread-and-Butter' aim and hence is very narrow in outlook. To earn one's living is not, of course, an unworthy aim; but this is not the only aim in life. We are born not merely to *live*, but we live for nobler aims which can be achieved by our acquaintance with the ancient culture along with the modern one. Direct contact with Sanskrit makes the former possible. If, again, Sanskrit is not directly useful in after-life, how much useful are algebra, geometry and higher mathematics-the other subjects in the curriculum? It is difficult to understand why Sanskrit alone should be an eyesore to the modernists posing to be educationists!

The demand of a national language like Hindi need not be underestimated. Yet, there is no necessity of prescribing Hindi as a regular subject in the curriculum which is already over-crowded.

in them. In addition to the fine arts there are also many useful arts, which have been enumerated to be *sixty-four*. Scattered references to them in Sanskrit literature or independent Sanskrit manuals on them, would supply data for doing much constructive work, in the absence of which those arts have become obsolete and are now supposed to be non-existent.

If it is agreed, say the *modernists*, that those who are unwilling to exert themselves mentally should take to subjects other than the classics, it inevitably follows that the classics cannot be made compulsory for all. For, in the first place, a large majority of the pupils of average abilities and insufficient means cannot continue their education after the Matriculation Examination, and consequently they have not the good fortune of receiving the benefits of classical learning which can be availed of only in colleges. In England, the pupils continuing college education are 6 per cent. only, and those entering the Faculty of Arts are 3per cent. only. In India the percentage of students getting the chance of college education must be still lower than this. Secondly, many students of this majority are not so linguistically minded as to feel a liking for the classics. This fact proves beyond doubt that a large majority of students have more aptitude for taking 'technical subjects', and that only a select few have the aptitude for classical languages. Thirdly, the non-Hindus are less inclined to take Sanskrit than other languages. All such students—and their number is not inconsiderable—will have to be excluded from the number of students learning Sanskrit. It is, therefore, impossible to prescribe Sanskrit as a compulsory subject for all.

The partial truth, say the *classicists*, of the impossibility of making Sanskrit a compulsory subject, may be admitted; but on the basis of modern psychology, they contradict some of the fallacious arguments put forth by the modernists. The assumption of the modernists that all pupils do not possess the same degree of linguistic ability, is largely grounded on their faith in heredity. According to the theory of Heredity, differences among individuals are held to be innate and cannot be accounted for except by assuming that they have been transmitted from generation to generation. But recent scientific researches demonstrate that the theory of the transmission of hereditary characteristics cannot be conclusively proved. The fact is that individual tendencies that are popularly credited to family heredity are mainly due to social heredity or environment. Some allowance may, of course, be made for the transmission of family traits; yet the environment, in which an individual is brought up, has a greater influence over his development than mere heredity has. Thus the argument of innate linguistic ability cannot stand to scrutiny. If proper environment is provided, habits of clear and correct speech can be cultivated. If the children of backward classes, who have rare opportunities for correct speech, are supplied with a suitable environment, they develop the language sense to a high degree. The weak linguistic ability found among a majority of average pupils is more due to their uncongenial home conditions; while the better linguistic ability of the pupils of advanced classes owes its credit to their linguistically favourable surroundings. If the modernists maintain that they alone, who have a better linguistic ability,

should study Sanskrit, then their argument appears to smack of the conservative attitude of the orthodox Vaidikas to bar the backward classes out of the Vedic studies! In view, therefore, of the possibility of more and more backward boys taking Sanskrit, it is highly desirable for the educator to seek to create better educative forces for developing linguistic abilities.

It is quite natural that the pupils of average abilities and insufficient means should discontinue their education after they are matriculated. But it is useless to adduce conditions prevailing in England, unless adequate provision has been made for the further education of such pupils in technical or other useful subjects, just as it is done in the 'Continuation Schools' of England. Everybody knows well enough how hard such students have to struggle through life. In the absence of 'Continuation Schools' why should students not study, upto the Matriculation Examination, as much Sanskrit as would enable them to understand and enjoy by themselves verses from the रामायण and the महाभारत, the great epics of India, and prose works of the type of the पञ्चतन्त्र and the हितोपदेश? Why should matriculates not receive, at least, this much benefit of the classical learning earlier than they do now? Is it a very high demand? If the matriculates cannot reach even this level, should it not be concluded that the fault lies with the methods of teaching rather than with the language itself? The non-Hindus may or may not study Sanskrit; but it is certainly not unreasonable to hope that the Hindus at least will study Sanskrit as compulsorily as they do algebra and geometry. Our main aim of teaching Sanskrit in the school course should be to introduce

an average matriculate, as early as possible, to the rich ideas and thoughts in the two great epics, so as to enable him to appreciate them and pass his leisure hours in life in an exalted way.

—0—

HINDU METHODOLOGY OF EDUCATION,

or

The Ancient Methods of Approach to Sanskrit Literature.

No innovations in education, howsoever fascinating they may be, will be successful, unless they are based on the best traditions of the past. The best method of teaching Sanskrit cannot be evolved by simply adopting the Western methods, unless we take into account the nature of the Sanskrit language and literature, and the methods of its teaching as employed by the Shastris so as to suit that nature. So, before dispensing with the Pathashala method as useless and unintelligent, it would be advisable on our part to observe and examine its various details and try to preserve the best parts of it. It is, therefore, high time to discover points of similarity and contrast between the Shastri method and the New method, and try to effect a happy combination of both, for making the improved teaching of Sanskrit bear permanent fruit.

The methods of the Shastris have not only been useful in teaching the young, but have also been applied to the higher study of literature and

Shastras. Among them there are two traditional ways regarding the order in which grammar and literature should be taught to beginners. While the Pandits of Northern India are in favour of beginning the study of Sanskrit with 'लक्षण' or grammar as a science and introducing literature afterwards, those of Southern India favour the teaching of 'लक्ष्य' or literature first, accompanied by the minimum of practical grammar necessary for its understanding. Of course, in the Deccan, the study of grammar as a science through the सिद्धान्तकौमुदी follows the study of literature. It will thus be seen that the method of the Southern Pandits is more in keeping with the modern principles of language-study, and also the Pandits of Northern India have begun to acknowledge its efficacy and superiority in juvenile teaching.

From the child's point of view, a flaw that is supposed to exist in the Shastri method is that in the very beginning pupils are made to undergo the process of learning by rote the शब्दरूपावलि, समासचक्र, अमरकोश, धातुरूपावलि (in some cases), and a few स्तोत्रs and सुभाषितs. This course goes on for about six months, after which the study of literature begins. The utility of this memorization is realised by pupils later on, when they actually begin to study literature. Though the study of literature helps them afterwards to assimilate with comprehension what they have learned formerly by rote, the procedure in the initial stage is somewhat unintelligent and tedious.

Yet this flaw need not be much magnified. Even if we take into consideration the up-to-date researches in Experimental Psychology, this learning

by rote should not be taken to be much harmful or unscientific. Though ' habit-memory ' is involved in this process rather than 'true memory', 'habit memory', according to psychologists, is not altogether imageless. The forms in the रूपावलि are not non-sense syllables or imageless words. There is, moreover, a sort of rhythm in the repetition of those forms; and this rhythm indirectly helps pupils to memorize words. If the forms in the रूपावलि have to be retained in memory throughout life for keeping some contact with Sanskrit literature, it is most essential for habit-formation or organization of proper disposition to get them learned by heart in childhood, which is the most favourable period for retention or 'prolonged memory'. It is already an established fact that some amount of intelligent memorizing is necessary for the ready grasp of any language. If then we desire pupils to learn by heart those forms with comprehension, the remedy to be adopted for lessening the evil of unintelligent memorizing would be first of all to give at the initial stage some 'conversation lessons' in Sanskrit so as to make the pupils acquainted with the types of a Sanskrit sentence, and to let them understand through conversation the function of cases or inflexions in that sentence. It must be remembered here that the unit of language is, according to the Modern Principles of Language-study, a sentence and not a word. Of course, any new language should be introduced through sentences employed in coversation and not through disconnected words. After such 'conversation lessons' it would be advisable to make the pupils compare and contrast the Sanskrit inflexions with those in the mother tongue and then to supply

vernacular meanings of 'model words', the forms of which the pupils would learn. To facilitate this memory-work the 'principle of analogy' may be employed to lead the pupils to observe similarity in the various forms of Sanskrit words. Besides, from the point of view of simplicity, frequency and utility, words in the रूपावलि will have to be re-arranged.

Despite the tedium of rote-learning, a relieving feature in this method is the emphasis on 'oral work before written work or reading,' which shows us how a principle of language-study has been unwittingly followed by the Shastris. The learning of the forms of nouns and verbs gives pupils ample phonetic drill (आवर्तन, सन्था) which decidedly helps them to improve their Sanskrit pronunciation. Another good feature of this memory-work is that the Shastris, instead of tiring their pupils' energy in the beginning with the drudgery of the formations of nouns and verbs as in the Grammar-translation method, stress the mastery of readymade forms of frequent nouns and verbs in the शब्दरूपावलि and धातुरूपावलि; and hence the study of literature, with the knowledge of this minimum of grammatical material, is started in the Shastri method much earlier than it is done in the Grammar-translation method. Sanskrit literature shows its peculiar predilection for the Nominal rather than for the Verbal Style*. In other words, it abounds in the forms of nouns and derivatives rather than in the

* "If the treatises of Panini and others had perished, and we had to construct a grammar of the Sanskrit from the classical literature (distinguished for its Nominal Style), our Verb and the Taddhita portion would be very meagre."

—Dr. R. G. Bhandarkar: W. P. Lectures.

actual forms of finite verbs; and the methods of the Shastris are quite in consonance with this nature of Sanskrit. Obviously, as more stress is laid, in the Shastri method, on the function of the case-forms of nouns than on the verbal forms, the energy of pupils, without being unnecessarily wasted in the derivation of verbal forms, is reserved and better utilized for the mastery of other important aspects of functional grammar, which directly help the understanding of literature, and which are quite sufficient even for the advanced study of the पञ्च-महाकाव्यs.

In this respect, the viewpoint of the Shastris is that the finite verb occupies a modest position in a Sanskrit sentence, since the major part of it generally consists of the subject and the object with their various adjuncts. They, therefore, say that it is enough for average students, not wishing to be specialists in grammar, to know in a broad outline that such and such a verb is in such and such a tense, mood, person and number. The relation, say the Shastris, existing between a verb and a noun in a sentence being chiefly denoted by कारकविभक्तिs or case-forms, the knowledge of कारकs or case-relations is more important than that of the finite verb. Thus the detailed knowledge of कारकs and a nodding acquaintance with verbal forms directly help pupils to understand the meaning of a sentence, and consequently, literature. This practical outlook of the Shastris sufficiently accounts for their emphasis, at the initial stage, on the detailed knowledge of case-forms. A since compounds are mainly based on cas tions, and since a sound knowledge of the fi

of cases is presupposed for their dissolution, the study of the समासचक्र in the Shastri method after that of the शब्दरूपावलि is a natural gradation.

Moreover, as many of the provincial languages of India have been derived from or influenced by Sanskrit, they contain the same number of inflexions as the latter. Hence, the knowledge of inflexions and their function, which the pupils acquire while learning their mother tongue, serves them well for knowing the same in Sanskrit. Again, the study of the mother tongue, particularly of its poetry, makes the pupils acquainted with a *few sandhis* and compounds. Thus it will be seen that the knowledge of the mother tongue is of immense help to pupils for the study of Sanksrit, and that the Shastris intuitively follow the psychological principle of proceeding from the known to the unknown.

It would, therefore, be presumptuous to suppose that the Shastris knew nothing of the psychology of language-learning and the principles of language-study. The views expressed by the वैयाकरणs, नैरुक्तs, नैयायिकs, मीमांसकs and आलङ्कारिकs about the denotative function or import of words (शब्दशक्ति) are fraught with pregnant suggestions which could be culled as principles of language-study. When the Sanskrit language has perhaps been one of the most perfect and scientific expressions of the human mind, and when we actually find that Hindus have made substantial contributions to the different branches of the linguistic science, viz. phonology, grammar, etymology, etc., there is nothing strange if the various schools of thought in ancient India should anticipate some principles of philology and language-study as propounded by Western Scholars.

The various modes of learning the denotative function or import of words as recognized by all schools of thought in India are*:—

(1) Grammar, (2) Comparison, (3) Dictionary, (4) Statement of a trustworthy person, (5) Usage of elders, (6) Context or supplementary statement, (7) Explanation by synonyms or paraphrase and (8) Contiguity with a well-known word.

Vishwanatha Nyaya-Panchanana hints that ideas can be conveyed even through gestures, facial expressions, etc.†

Out of these eight modes, the fourth and the fifth are the most important, as they are representative of the Direct Method of the West, and allow full play to the 'spontaneous capacities' of a child to learn a language; while the rest compel him to use his 'studial capacities' which are generally developed in adult age. According to the fifth mode, a child learns the import of words principally from the observation of the activities and usage of elders, and forms the habit of establishing a 'direct bond' between words and ideas by the psychological process of 'unconscious assimilation' and 'imitation.'

Particularly the अन्विताभिधानवादीs of the मीमांसा school recognize the 'usage of elders' as the chief mode of language-learning, and hold that 'a sentence is the unit of language and not a word'; while the अभिहितान्वयवादीs of the same school say that the

* शक्तिग्रहं व्याकरणोपमानकोशाप्तवाक्याद् व्यवहारतश्च ।
वाक्यस्य शेषाद्विवृतेर्वदन्ति सान्निध्यतः सिद्धपदस्य वृद्धाः ॥

† न तु ज्ञायमानं पदं करणं, पदाभावेऽपि मौनिश्लोकादौ शाब्दबोधात् ।
— सिद्धान्तमुक्तावलिः

senses of individual words (पद्s) are combined to form the larger sense of a sentence as a whole, and recognize आकाङ्क्षा (expectancy), योग्यता (consistency), संनिधि (contiguity) and तात्पर्यार्थ (purport) of words as the means of understanding a sentence. The वैयाकरणs who propound the theory of स्फोट by holding a non-eternal word to be the manifested form of the unmanifested or eternal word (स्फोट), acknowledge वाक्यस्फोट or the indivisible sense of a sentence as the chief one ; yet for facilitating the understanding of pupils they sanction the existence of individual words and resort to the analytical process of separating words into their प्रकृतिs (original forms) and प्रत्ययs (suffixes). The आलङ्कारिकs amalgamate in general all these views about language and acknowledge व्यङ्ग्यार्थ (suggested sense) along with वाच्यार्थ (expressed sense) and लक्ष्यार्थ (secondary sense). These are, in short, the views of the Indian schools of thought about the relation between a word and its meaning and the modes of learning both of them.

As indicated above, the regular and intelligent study of literature according to the Shastri method is started after the thorough learning of the minimum of functional grammar and the lexicon for about six months. Generally this study begins with the reading of the हितोपदेश or पञ्चतन्त्र and the second canto of the रघुवंश. The Shastris are here in complete agreement with the modern methodists in starting with connected passages from literature and not with disconnected sentences, which in the Grammar-translation method are introduced simply to illustrate the rules of grammar. But some Shastris,

instead of beginning with stories in prose from the पञ्चतन्त्र or हितोपदेश and with simple and interesting सुभाषितs, teach first of all रघुवंश, which is for pupils in the elementary stage a hard nut to crack. In the interest of beginners the introduction of simple prose rather than of poetry, then of concrete and interesting सुभाषितs, and then of poetic passages from the रामायण and the महाभारत rather than of cantos from the पञ्चमहाकाव्यs, would be a better gradation in the teaching of literature. The high-flown style of the later महाकाव्यs and Sanskrit prose being beyond the comprehension of young pupils, original passages from the classical literature will have to be adapted or simplified to suit the capacities of beginners. Shastris with a progressive bent of mind agree to this principle of gradation, and preferring, at the outset, the teaching of the हितोपदेश or पञ्चतन्त्र to that of the पञ्चमहाकाव्यs have improved upon the old order. Further, to develop enough language sense and improve pronunciation they ask their pupils to learn by heart, along with the रूपावलि etc., a large number of सुभाषितs, the meaning of which can be easily understood by the pupils without any explanation, owing to the occurrence in them of many तत्सम (Sanskrit) words current in the mother tongue.

In accordance with a well-known Sanskrit saying, § even a dull person does not begin any work, unless he knows its purpose or motive. Naturally, when the study of any literary work or Shastra was commenced, four requisites or अनुबन्धs † were dis-

---

§ प्रयोजनमनुद्दिश्य न मन्दोऽपि प्रवर्तते ।

† अनुबन्धचतुष्टयं नामाधिकारिविषयसम्बन्धप्रयोजनानि ।—वेदान्तसारः

cussed: (i) the competency of the student to understand a work, (ii) the subject-matter, (iii) connection between the subject-matter and the work to be studied and (iv) the motive or inducement to enter upon the study. It is worth while noting that out of these four requisites the student and his capacity being the most important are given the first place in the अनुबन्धs. Also at the beginning of many books appear the significant words 'बालानां सुखबोधाय', 'बालमित्रप्रबोधाय' (for the easy grasp of beginners), which indicate that the capacity of a student was a matter of the foremost consideration. Again, the four अनुबन्धs giving the pupil a broad and synthetic view of the subject to be studied, become incentives to his further study.

Here one cannot resist the temptation of comparing the five Herbartian steps of teaching (viz. I Preparation, II Presentation, III Association, IV Generalization and V Application) with the five formal steps followed bv the Hindus in the learning of various subjects. Of course, the formal steps of the Hindus do not quite correspond to the Herbartian steps except in the case of their number. The number and sequence of the steps followed by the Hindus varied with the nature of the subject-matter to be taught, and hence they were more flexible than rigid. In actual practice, even the number and sequence of the Herbartian steps are never rigidly followed for fear that the procedure of teaching would be made mechanical at the sacrifice of spontaneous charm in it. It was then wise on the part of the Hindus that they did not adopt the same number of steps for the teaching of different subjects. The steps for teaching different

Shastras were more logical than psychological and more analytic than synthetic, as they suited the students who had reached the conceptual level; whereas in the elementary stage, the steps for teaching 'literature', though not strictly psychological or synthetic, suited, on the whole, the pupils of the perceptual level.

Now the steps for the teaching of any Shastra, particularly Logic, were-(i) Assertion or proposition, (ii) Reason, (iii) Example, (iv) Application of the example and (v) Conclusion.*

Those for the teaching of Meemansa and Vedanta were—(i) Statement of the topic, (ii) Doubt, (iii) Objection, (iv) Answer or the established view, and (v) Consistency of the topic with the preceding and following ones. §

In regard to the fifth step the student had to ascertain the consistency of a topic with a section, of a section with a chapter, and of a chapter with the whole work or Shastra.† Thus the last step helped the student to look at a subject mainly from the synthetic point of view.

To make sure of the purport (तात्पर्य) of a book or a subject in a synthetic manner the Meemansakas have pronounced six steps, and asked us to look at a work or a subject from the following points of

---

* प्रतिज्ञाहेतूदाहरणोपनयनिगमनानि पञ्चावयवाः— तर्कसंग्रहः ।

§ विषयो विशयश्चैव पूर्वपक्षस्तथोत्तरम् ।
सङ्गतिश्चेति पञ्चाङ्गं शास्त्रेऽधिकरणं विदुः ॥

† शास्त्रेऽध्याये तथा पादे न्यायसङ्गतयस्त्रिधा ।
शास्त्रादिविषये ज्ञाते तत्तत्सङ्गतिरूह्यताम् ॥

—वैयासिकन्यायमाला.

view—(I) Unity of the beginning and conclusion of a work, (II) Repetition of the main topic in various contexts, (III) Novelty of the subject-matter, (IV) Fruit or result, (V) Praise or incidental remarks as distinguished from the main theme and (VI) Arguments in favour of the main topic.†

It must be noted here that the five steps of Logic, as indicated above, being based on the general process and sequence of human thought are employed in the study of many Shastras. Those logical steps along with the Law of Causal Relation (कार्यकारणसम्बन्ध) and the Seven Categories (सप्तपदार्थs) with their sub-divisions have contributed much to the methodical treatment of many Shastras, and are a distinct achievement from the point of view of methodology. Thus Logic and Grammar hold a prominent place among the Hindu Shastras as sciences of wider application, the study of logic being quite indispensable to the study of any other Shastra. Instead of those five steps some thinkers recognize three steps only by dispensing with प्रतिज्ञा and उपनय, since प्रतिज्ञा (assertion) is the same as निगमन (conclusion), and since उपनय by mere repetition unifies हेतु, पक्ष and साध्य in the form of a statement. But inference (अनुमान) is divided into 'inference for one's self' (स्वार्थानुमान) and 'inference for others' (परार्थानुमान). The first consists of three steps, while the second being composed of five steps is utilized for demonstrating a topic to others. This demonstration is readily converted into five steps

---

† उपक्रमोपसंहारावभ्यासोऽपूर्वता फलम् ।
अर्थवादोपपत्ती च लिङ्गं तात्पर्यनिर्णये ॥

of logical teaching and is correlated with the above special steps of other Shastras. The modern methodology too enunciates five Herbartian steps which are grounded on Logic as well as Psychology. The modern technique of teaching is, therefore, not only logical but psychological also. Again, the Hindu syllogism of five steps is not merely a 'deductive' but a 'deductive-inductive' process; for, the third step or 'general proposition with an example' (उदाहरण) is a brief record of the actual 'observation' of facts. The सूत्रs or generalisations which the वैयाकरणs arrived at by employing the Logical Methods of Agreement and Difference (अन्वय & व्यतिरेक) are also the records of the linguistic phenomena actually observed. It may thus be stated that the वैयाकरणs used the logical methods of 'Induction' and 'Deduction' in expounding grammar.

In spite of the five steps followed in the teaching of Shastras, the logical procedure that was generally resorted to in the actual expounding of a Shastra consisted of three steps, viz. उद्देश, लक्षण and परीक्षा. (I) उद्देश means the 'enumeration' of the topics to be dealt with in their succession. (II) लक्षण is the 'definition' of a thing; and it ought to be free from the faults of अव्याप्ति (non-pervasion), अतिव्याप्ति (over-extension) and असम्भव (total absence) of the attributes of that thing. (III) Lastly, परीक्षा or 'examination' is the settlement of the true nature of a thing by the application of four means of valid knowledge, viz. प्रत्यक्ष (perception), अनुमान (inference), उपमान (comparison) and शब्द (verbal testimony).

From this we need not suppose that Hindus concentrated their attention on Logic alone to the detriment of Psychology. Leaving aside the distant past we can find from the Upanishadic times scattered references to psychological problems in the vast range of Sanskrit literature. The Upanishads describe 'Mind' as an organism unifying in itself its own functions as काम (desire), सङ्कल्प (will), विचिकित्सा (doubt or discrimination), श्रद्धा (faith), अश्रद्धा (absence of faith), धृति (confidence, contentment, constancy), अधृति (want of confidence, etc.), ह्री (shame or bashfulness), धी (understanding or reason) and भी (fear)$. These functions, being the manifestations of the same organic unity (mind), can well compare with the instincts propounded by modern psychologists. It must be noted that these various phases of the mind are not described here as distinct Faculties coming severally into operation, but are the functions of the same 'living organism', (अन्तःकरण) as waves on the surface of the sea. From this we clearly comprehend that the Upanishadic sages do not lose sight of the inherent unity the mind,* as the Faculty Psychologists lose. In spite of the foregoing varied functions of the mind, later Sanskrit works like the साङ्ख्यकारिका, the पातञ्जलयोगसूत्रs, the योगवासिष्ठ, the भगवद्गीता and others recognised, as the shortest cut to Self-Realization, four functions of the mind, viz. मनस्, बुद्धि, चित्त and अहकार. As these

---

$ कामः सङ्कल्पो विचिकित्सा श्रद्धाऽश्रद्धा धृतिरधृतिर्ह्रीर्धीर्भी-रित्येतत्सर्वं मन एव। (बृ. उ. १।५।३)

* इत्येतत्सर्वं मन एव। Note that 'मनस्' is in the singular number in spite of its manifold functions.

four functions are called अन्तःकरणचतुष्टय or the internal organs of the आत्मन् to hold communion with the environment through the senses, connection can be established between external Nature and the Self by means of these internal organs (करणs), which lead an aspirant gradually to the highest regions of the आत्मन्–the ultimate goal of all beings–on the ascending scales of मनस्, बुद्धि, चित्त and अहंकार. In ancient times the highest aim of education was the Realization of the Self in the innumerable things of the Universe. In other words, this is not the weal or emancipation of the Individual Soul but also of the Community; and the functions of the mind, as mentioned above, were enumerated to be four only with this particular end in view. These functions come into operation on the conscious level, yet they do not sever connection with the unconscious level of the mind, which is the main spring of all conscious behaviour. Although they do not quite correspond to the threefold activity (Feeling, Thinking and Willing) of consciousness as propounded by modern psychology, yet मनस् can be compared slightly with Affection or Feeling and Conation or Willing, since मनस् functions through सङ्कल्प and विकल्प [सङ्कल्पविकल्पात्मकं मनः] or the transient (passing) phases of Will and Emotion. The phases of Affection and Conation can be found in विकल्प and सङ्कल्प respectively, yet both of them do not exhibit so much stability as to reach the state of determination for action. The power of thinking or reasoning is, on the other hand, connected with बुद्धि, which predominates in the niceties of Logic. चित्त or Memory is connect-

-ed with the experiences of the past and works in alliance with the Imagination (कल्पना or प्रतिभा) of poets. This will clearly show that Hindus have formed definite views on the psychology of Self-Realization, or in modern terminology, on the Sublimation of instincts, and have made use of this psychology in their educational efforts. Among the four functions of the mind each latter is more internal than the former; and hence these functions serve as graded steps to Self-Realization.

We cannot say that the threefold Western distinction of Consciousness into Feeling, Thinking and Willing is superior to the foregoing fourfold distinction of the Hindus. The inadequacy of this threefold distinction has been sufficiently proved by ' Psycho-Analysis, ' which ventures to probe into the unconscious level of the mind. Although this unconscious level cannot be precisely described as सुषुप्ति or deep sleep, it being intimately connected also with the unconsciousness in the wakeful state, yet deep sleep mostly consists of this unconscious level. The योगवासिष्ठ & श्रीशङ्कराचार्य (in his commentary on the माण्डूक्यकारिका) analyse the wakeful state into जाग्रज्जाग्रत् (wakefulness-consciousness in the wakeful state), जाग्रत्स्वप्न (reverie or day-dream), and जाग्रत्सुषुप्ति (sleep or unconsciousness in the wakeful state). Thus the state of forgetfulness or sub-consciousness in the wakeful state is जाग्रत्सुषुप्ति (deep sleep in the wakeful state). Hence we can approximately compare the unconscious level of the Psycho-Analysts with deep sleep (सुषुप्ति) either in wakefulness or in deep sleep itself, or with both of them. The attempts of the Psycho-Analysts, therefore, have

decidedly not proceeded beyond groping in the dark of 'deep sleep' (सुषुप्ति), which the Hindus have long ago transcended by pointing to the Self-luminous and Eternal Seer (साक्षी, द्रष्टा, परमात्मा, सदाशिव) of all the three states of the mind. This Seer is the unifying principle not only of an individual but also of all beings and the Universe. He is the unifier of individuality (व्यष्टि) and totality (समष्टि). This again shows that the Hindus have devoted their attention to the Pyschology of the Individual as well as of the Group.

The Will or सङ्कल्प that is associated with मनस् is indeterminate; yet the Will that is allied with बुद्धि (Reason) is of the nature of determinate action (व्यवसायात्मिका). The latter form of Will transforms itself into human activities, religious and secular. The activities that are performed with various worldly ends in view are secular; while those that lead one to the Eternal Bliss are religious. According to this two-fold manifestation of Will sciences dealing with several branches of knowledge are also classified into worldly sciences and the Transcendental Science. Worldly sciences (अपरा विद्या) lead human beings to worldly prosperity (अभ्युदय); while the Transcendental Science (परा विद्या) deals with the inner progress of a human being towards his original destination, and leads him to the Eternal Bliss (निःश्रेयस) or the Realization of the Self. It need not be supposed from this classification that the Hindu thinkers concentrated their attention on

नि:श्रेयस alone by ignoring worldly prosperity and worldly sciences. The progress of worldly sciences in India can be seen in the development of sixty-four *Arts* (कला) and fourteen branches of Human Knowledge (विद्या). This lore has found expression in some written works on the respective subjects and has been handed down by oral tradition from generation to generation in several families and classes noted for speciality in it. The paucity of written works on it, modern machinery, industrialization and general apathy have, however, given a serious set-back to all of it, and the worldly sciences in India in their struggle for existence are on the point of being extinct.

The Individual Will, that transforms itself into manifold human activities and branches of human knowledge, is a fraction of the Universal Will or Energy which emanates through हिरण्यगर्भ (the illuminant of the Cosmic Dream) who is a manifestation of the Eternal Seer. The Universal Will or energy of हिरण्यगर्भ is the same as the Will of an Individual, and manifests itself in the same way in which it does in an individual. Just as human actions, *before* they come into operation, are of the nature of Will (सङ्कल्प), so this ' Creation ', before it comes into being, is of the nature of the Universal Will. This *phenomenon of the transformation of the* individual or cosmic dream into the individual or cosmic wakefulness is constantly going on through the energy (शक्ति) of the Eternal Seer (साक्षी, द्रष्टा, शिव), who illumines every individual or cosmic activity

and inactivity, and unifies all the three states of beings, viz. Wakefulness, Dream and Sleep, or the present, the future and the past. This is, in short, unity in diversity. The same Cosmic Will that creates this universe unfolds itself through innumerable forms of the Individual Will. ' It prompts a person with a particular motive or will to achieve success or attain proficiency in a particular thing, and enables that person to concentrate all activities, educational or non-educational, on that motive or will. When the original unity of the Individual Will with the Cosmic Will is re-established, success in matters, religious and secular, or educational and non-educational, is not far off, since it immediately leads one either to worldly prosperity (अभ्युदय) or to the eternal emancipation (निःश्रेयस). All forms of human activity are thus rooted in this Will (सङ्कल्प) and its stability. A special science, named मन्त्रशास्त्र, which has been based on the potency of this Will (सङ्कल्प) and on its transformation into actions, has been developed in India and is worthy of being studied as the Psychology of Action or the science of training the Will.

Out of the four functions of the internal organ (अन्तःकरण) the ego or अहङ्कार makes every being conscious of himself and leads him to establish his own individuality in the scheme of the universe. This may be called the instinct of self-assertion or the self-instinct. This ego or consciousness of 'individuality' is not different from the Eternal Seer, as a drop from water. In reality, it is merely an attribute

superimposed (अध्यस्त) upon the Eternal Seer (द्रष्टा), who illuminates conscious as well as unconscicus phases of the mind. It again interlinks the Subject (विषयी) with the Object (विषय) or the internal nature (अन्तःप्रकृति) with the external one (बाह्यप्रकृति). When this self-consciousness (अहङ्कार) merges in the eternal आत्मन् or the Highest Self, the state of emancipation or Realization of the Self is manifested. The Eternal Self or Seer illumines innumerable individual souls or minds, and the aggregate (समष्टि) of all such minds being illumined by the same Eternal Seer can be termed 'Group Mind' according to modern psychology. This group mind can be conceived only when similarity or unity of individual souls or minds is postulated.

Western Psychology has not as yet achieved success in proving the existence of this unity, or in accounting for it. It is up to now engaged in describing in detail the various manifestations of the moods of mind rather than in pointing to the substratum (अधिष्ठान) of all of them. It delights in counting the waves on the surface of the sea rather than in fathoming water. It seeks to *describe* mind rather than *define* it. This trend of Western Psychology turns a thinker away from the substratum and leads him to commit the blunder, as the Ultra-Behaviourists do, of conceiving mind as not apart from physical behaviour. Psychology cannot hope to reach the stage of perfection, if it departs from the substratum of mental activities and concentrates only on the external manifestations of

the mind. The Eternal Seer (साक्षी, द्रष्टा) is the substratum of all conscious and unconscious phases of the mind and in him the line of demarcation between the 'Conscious' and the 'Unconscious' vanishes, no scope being afforded for words to describe the 'Seer' or the 'Absolute'. When the 'object', which is not originally apart from the subject, is dissolved in the latter, the original state of the Eternal Seer or the Absolute is manifested, leaving no room for any kind of verbal description or definition. It is this Eternal Seer who illuminates the individual minds as well as the group mind, and removing all differences of individual souls or minds establishes the unity or uniformity of the group mind. Thus the oriental thinkers have gone ahead of the Westerners in respect of psychological researches. It is then beyond doubt that the Hindus, without leaving out of account the substratum of mind, have substantially contributed to the educational principles based on the psychology of the individual as well as of the group.

An attempt has been made above to show in a broad outline the main features of Hindu psychology. It must be noted here that sciences that lead us to knowledge can be correlated with one another from a comprehensive point of view, though the detailed treatment of a particular branch of knowledge obliges us to dissociate one science from another. The truth of this statement is realized especially in the case of psychology and philosophy, which, though they are distinguished from

each other for the sake of convenient exposition, are wrongly supposed to be innately distinct from each other. Psychology and Philosophy are, *however, so inseparably connected that one* would remain imperfect without the aid of the other. Philosophy, which is the science of sciences, relieves itself from pure abstractions by resorting to psychology and describing the phenomena of the mind, which is in some way connected with the inner soul; while the real aim of psychology is, and ought to be, to culminate in philosophy. Hoffding says, " In many ways philosophical research has played into the hands of psychological research; consciously or unconsciously philosophical speculation always works with psychological elements, and in philosophical speculations are deposited many profound psychological observations and ideas ". This is the reason why the Philosophy of the Hindus contains numerous psychological observations, which, if culled and organized, give us a consistent idea of the nature of Hindu psychology, Thus the psychology and philosophy of the Upanishads were amalgamated in ancient times with the psychology of the साङ्ख्य and योग systems. Nay, the psychology of the साङ्ख्य and योग systems, particularly of the योग system, seems to be generally accepted even by the heterodox systems of the बौद्धs, जैनs, etc., though there might be differences among them as regards the details and the ultimate reality. It is hoped that the Hindu psychology would supply a sound basis

for the Psychology of the Unconscious, which has recently attracted the attention of thinkers in the West.

This psychology and the principles of education propounded by the Hindus have resulted, not in the repression of instincts, but in the *Sublimation* of the individual and the group mind. The culmination of their individual and social activities, in their sublimated form, is found not only in the worldly prosperity, but in the Realization of the Self. The proper direction of all those worldly and religious activities can be traced in the nation-building attempts of Shree Krishna, Lord Buddha, Ashoka, Chandragupta, Chanakya, Shree Shankaracharya, Vidyaranya, Shivaji and various other Indian heroes and saints, who, for the propagation of their particular motives and teachings, realized the inner truth of 'group psychology' as a powerful instrument for the uplift of the nation. The idea, therefore, of the 'group mind' is not foreign to the Hindus, and the science that shows the ways of properly directing the group mind to a worthy goal is not unknown to them.

The 'group mind' and the psychical laws underlying it have also been dealt with in the Science of Dramaturgy, which was long ago carried to perfection by venerable Bharata Muni. In a drama represented on the stage, the laws governing the working of the group mind are presupposed for its successful conclusion and bewitching effect as a whole. The audience assembled for witnessing a

dramatic performance represents 'a psychological group', and a dramatist has to satisfy the curiosity of spectators, all and sundry, by writing and representing a drama in an effective manner. The नाट्यशास्त्र of भरत lays down rules that ought to be followed by dramatists and actors for making their plays full of abiding interest.

Again, भरत deals with the *emotional aspect of psychology* by constructing the *theory of* रस (the highest joy or aesthetic delight). He has broadly enumerated *forty-nine* emotions (भाव), out of which he takes *eight* as स्थायिभावs (sentiments or permanent emotions), *eight* as सात्त्विकभावs (involuntary expressions of intense emotions), and *thirty-three* as व्यभिचारिभावs (transient or subordinate emotins). If the सात्त्विकभावs are taken to be the bodily effects of emotions from the physical point of view and classified with अनुभावs (consequents or ensuants), the number of भावs (emotions) would be *forty-one*. The स्थायिभावs exist in the minds of all living beings in the form of latent impressions (संस्कारs) or permanent instincts (वासना) from their birth. According to भरत they* are—(1) रति (Love), (2) हास (Mirth), (3) शोक (Sorrow), (4) क्रोध (Anger), (5) उत्साह (Energy), (6) भय (Fear), (7) जुगुप्सा (Disgust), and (8) विस्मय (Astonishment). These स्थायिभावs, according to भरत, are developed into eight aesthetic sentiments (रस)†, which respectively are—

* भरत—नाट्यशास्त्र, अ. ६।१७. † भ. ना., अ. ६।१५.

(1) शृङ्गार (the Erotic), (2) हास्य (the Comic), (3) करुण (the Pathetic), (4) रौद्र (the Furious), (5) वीर (the Heroic), (6) भयानक (the Terrible), (7) बीभत्स (the Odious), and (8) अद्भुत (the Marvellous)*. Later authors have added शान्त (the Quietistic) as the ninth रस with 'शम' (Tranquillity) as its स्थायिभाव.

About seven of the above स्थायिभावs can be compared with the corresponding emotions in the list of fourteen primary emotions with their instincts enumerated by McDougall. The seven corresponding emotions of McDougall with their instincts are—(1) Lust-Mating, (2) Amusement-Laughter, (3) Distress-Appeal, (4) Anger-Combat, (5) Fear-Escape, (6) Disgust-Repulsion, and (7) Wonder-Curiosity. No parallel to the स्थायिभाव of उत्साह (Energy) and its रस 'वीर' (the Heroic) can be found in the list of McDougall. 'वीररस', however, may properly be connected with the emotion of *anger*, which can be its स्थायिभाव with its corresponding instinct of *combat*. Again, anger must be accompanied by 'उत्साह' (Energy) for the enhancement of वीररस. If वात्सल्य is recognized as a रस, it can be brought into line with the 'tender emotion' of McDougall with its corresponding 'parental instinct'.

The *eight* सात्त्विक भावs$ (involuntary expressions of mental states) are : (1) स्तम्भ (Paralysis), (2) स्वेद

---

* Some English equivalents to भावs etc. have been taken from the 'History of Sanskrit Poetics', Vol. II, by Dr. S. K. De.

$ भरत–नाट्यशास्त्र, अ. ६।२२.

(Sweating, Perspiration), (3) रोमाञ्च (Horripilation), (4) स्वरभङ्ग (Change of Voice), (5) वेपथु (Trembling), (6) वैवर्ण्य (Change of Colour), (7) अश्रु (Weeping, tears), and (8) प्रलय (Fainting). All these are the physical expressions of some intense emotion; yet they are not the definite indications of a particular emotion. For instance, horripilation (रोमाञ्च) is the indication of fear as well as joy, and tears (अश्रु) are the expression of sorrow as well as joy. Although these physical expressions refer to a *mental* state, yet भरत must have found it difficult to assign them to particular emotions. He, therefore, thought it expedient to signify the intense emotions through the general physical indications, and characterize them as ' सात्त्विकभावs. ' Even the modern psychology admits that though an emotion predominantly consists of the affective element, it is allied, in a lesser degree, with the conative element and some bodily expressions.* This nature of emotions, perhaps, induced भरत to give an indirect description of intense emotional states (सात्त्विक भावs) through their involuntary expressions on the body. The suggestion of a definite emotion like ' Sorrow ' or ' Fear ' through those general bodily expressions will, of course, depend upon the particutar context or situation in which they are exhibited. Properly speaking, the सात्त्विक भावs are the *effects* of intense emotions and

* McDougall : An Outline of Psychology, P. 317.

should be placed in the category of अनुभावs, as will be seen later on.

All the thirty—three व्यभिचारिभावs, $ otherwise called सञ्चारिभावs (Transient-subordinate emotions or Accessories), need not be mentioned here. A few of them are : निर्वेद (Self-disparagemant), शङ्का (Apprehension), असूया (Envy), चिन्ता (Anxiety, reflection), स्मृति (Recollection), धृति (Equanimity), व्रीडा (Shame, bashfulness), हर्ष (Joy), आवेग (Agitation, flurry), गर्व (Arrogance), विषाद (Despair), औत्सुक्य (Impatience) etc. These are directly indicative of the mental states; but some व्यभिचारिभावs like ग्लानि (weakness), श्रम (weariness), आलस्य (Indolence), जडता (Stupor) etc. are indirectly indicative of the mental states through the bodily expressions, and the same explanation as given above may be applied here also. A general remark may be made here that when भरत looks at mental states (सात्त्विक भावs or व्यभिचारिभावs) from the subjective point of view, he refers to them directly; and when he looks objectively at those states, he refers to them through physical expressions. For, the physical states mentioned by him are connected with their corresponding mental states. Every living being who shows a particular physical state can be thought to have some corresponding mental state. Again, there are some mental states which cannot be indicated except through physical expressions, and they are निद्रा

$ भरत—नाट्यशास्त्र, अ. ६।१८—२१.

(sleep or drowsiness), अपस्मार (Epilepsy), सुप्त (Dreaming), व्याधि (Sickness), उन्माद (Insanity), मरण (The state before death) etc., There is, however, some room for revision and re-organization in the list of the thirty-three व्यभिचारिभावs in the light of modern psychology. For instance, it is possible to find similarity between 'निर्वेद' (Self-disparagement) and McDougall's primary emotion of 'Negative Self-feeling' with its instinct of submission, and between गर्व (Arrogance) and the primary emotion of 'Positive self-feeling' with its instinct of self-assertion.

This treatment of emotions in the नाट्यशास्त्र is more or less psychological or rather psycho-physical. भरत does not deal so much with the cognitive and conative aspects of the mind as he does with its affective (emotional) aspect; for, he wants to expound the *theory* of रस (Aesthetic delight), which is manifested in the drama. In spite of a few flaws in his classification of emotions, भरत, the ancient sage, certainly deserves the credit of making a psychological approach to the drama and inspiring later authors to apply the dramatic theory of रस to poetry and literature in general. The theory of रस is centred in भरत's famous aphorism : 'विभावानुभावव्यभिचारिसंयोगाद्रसनिष्पत्तिः' $ which broadly means that the latent स्थायिभावs manifest themselves into रसs

---

भरत–नाट्यशास्त्र, अ. ६.

when they are united with the विभावs, अनुभावs, and व्यभिचारिभावs. In the phenomenal world when we come into contact with a particular situation, we naturally react to it. In other words, the situation serves as a *stimulus* which causes in us an emotional *response*, pleasant or unpleasant. Thus the stimulus is the cause, of which the response is the effect. This psychological fact has some resemblance to the theory of रस, though the stimulus-response formula does not exactly correspond to the विभावs etc. and रस. For, the stimulus and the response are respectively the real cause and the real effect in the phenomenal world, and the emotional effect or response produced by the stimulus is pleasure as well as pain; while the विभावs (Excitants) and अनुभावs (Ensuants) which are respectively the imaginary causes and effects in the world of drama and poetry invariably manifest a pleasurable response in the form of रस (Aesthetic delight). The विभावs (Excitants) are further sub-divided into आलम्बनविभाव (The essential excitant) and the उद्दीपनविभाव (The enhancing excitant). The former is the hero or heroine exciting emotions in drama or poetry, and the latter is the external situation or surroundings imagined in drama or poetry for favouring the excitement of emotions. Now अनुभावs (Ensuants) are the effects or physical expressions of the emotions of the hero or other characters in drama or poetry. They are almost the same as the सात्त्विकभावs; yet if a distinction between

the सात्त्विकभावs and अनुभावs is to be made, it may be said that the former are involuntary expressions, while the latter are voluntary expressions. When the स्थायिभाव of the hero or other characters is represented in drama or poetry through the skilful depiction of the विभावs, अनुभावs and व्यभिचारिभावs of the characters themselves, the same स्थायिभाव, which exists latently in the minds of spectators or readers, also, is awakened and developed into रस. Now in relation to the hero or other characters the विभावs in drama or poetry are the causes and the अनुभावs are the effects. Yet in relation to the spectators or readers the dramatic or poetic presentation of the विभावs, अनुभावs and व्यभिचारिभावs collectively becomes the cause of awakening रस in them. A thing to be noted in the case of the अनुभावs is that they become the causes with reference to the spectators or readers, even though with reference to the characters they are the effects.† When the spectators or readers identify themselves with the dramatic or poetic situation, the विभावs etc. being idealized in their minds are united with their स्थायिभाव and reveal in them extreme literary delight or रस. This delight makes itself visible on their

† स्थायिभावाननुभावयन्तः सामाजिकान् सभ्रूविक्षेपकटाक्षादयो रसपोषकारिणोऽनुभावाः। एते चाभिनयकाव्ययोरप्यनुभावयतां साक्षाद्भावकानामनुभवकर्मतयानुभूयन्त इत्यनुभवनमिति चानुभावा रसिकेषु व्यपदिश्यन्ते। विकारो (कार्यम्) भावसंसूचनात्मक इति तु लौकिकरसापेक्षया, इह (अलौकिकरसे) तु तेषां कारणत्वमेव।—दशरूपकम्, ४।३.

bodies in the form of their अनुभावs or सात्त्विकभावs which, though they are causes at the former stage, again appear as effects. Thus the theory of nine रसs with their स्थायिभावs, व्यभिचारिभावs, विभावs and अनुभावs treats mainly of the Affective or emotional aspect of the mind.

This रस, according to the peculiarity of the विभावs, etc., assumes particular phases of शृङ्गार, वीर, करुण, etc., and is experienced by all human beings. In other words, the union of the peculiar moods of actors and the audience, or of the Subject (विषयी) and the Object (विषय) in the dramatic or poetic representation, manifests a particular phase of रस. But as this रस, emancipated from its particular phases, is of the nature of supreme bliss (परनिर्वृति, आनन्द) underlying the nine रसs, it is unity in diversity. Hence, the ancient writers on dramaturgy like अभिनवगुप्त and later literary critics like जगन्नाथ correlated the Sanskrit Poetics with the philosophy of the Upanishads, and declared the highest delight derived from literature to be akin to the experience of the highest ब्रह्मन् (ब्रह्मास्वादसहोदर). Nay, they suggest that all literary delight for its consummation must get itself freed from all consiousness of particularity (विगलितवेद्यान्तर) and transformed into the highest bliss of परमात्मन् or the Eternal Seer, as is indicated by the Upanishadic saying, " The highest

---

* रसगङ्गाधर, P. 27.

bliss is रस itself. After attaining the very रस, he becomes full of delight." *

For the interesting representation of this रस with its eight or nine phases before the audience or the group mind, भरत has formulated some rules, which, in combination with the five elements of the dramatic plot (अर्थप्रकृतिs) and five psychological stages (क्रमावस्थाs), develop into five junctures (सन्धिs) of the drama. Every dramatic performance has to undergo these five junctures so as to come to a successful conclusion and maintain the unity and interest of the plot. The division of the plot into acts and scenes has been broadly conceived by भरत with this end in view. In actualities, however, the five junctures of the drama do not always correspond to its acts and scenes.

In the composition and representation of a drama the वस्तु or the plot is divided into the *principal* † or *main* action (आधिकारिक) and the *incidental* or *subsidiary* action (प्रासङ्गिक). Connection between the main plot and the subordinate elements, helping its successful achievement, is established by the correspondence or union of अर्थप्रकृतिs, क्रमावस्थाs and सन्धिs. Now, the five अर्थप्रकृतिs or elements of the plot in their succession are as

---

* रसो वै सः । रसं ह्येवायं लब्ध्वाऽऽनन्दीभवति । (तैत्तिरीयोपनिषद्).

† Some English equivalents to Sanskrit terms in dramaturgy have henceforth been borrowed from the English Translation of the दशरूपक by George C. O. Haas, 1912, (U.S. A.)

follows—(1) बीज or the *germ* indicates the beginning of the dramatic action. (2) बिन्दु or the *drop* is the *expansion* of the plot through the introduction of a subordinate element. This element disturbs the main plot, yet it maintains its continuity just like a drop of oil spreading on the surface of water. (3) पताका (episode), which is different from पताका-स्थानक (the dramatic irony of situation and words), is the spreading (expansion) of the plot still further like a fluttering banner, owing to the introduction of other subordinate elements aiding the main action. (4) प्रकरी (episodical incident) is almost the same as पताका; yet introducing a new subordinate element and occupying a short interval of time, it comes to a quick close. (5) कार्य is the *de'nouement* or conclusion, where the action of the plot reaches a successful end.

The five क्रमावस्थाs or psychological stages, which the drama undergoes are, in their proper sequence, the following ones-(1) आरम्भ is the *beginning*, where the ardent desire of a character in the drama for the achievement of the fruit or result (फलागम) is expressed for the first time. (2) यत्न is the *effort* or determined activity for the attainment of the fruit. (3) प्राप्त्याशा is the *expectation* of attaining the result, or the prospect of success. (4) नियताप्ति shows *surety of success* after the removal of obstacles in the way. (5) फलागम is the actual attainment of the fruit or result. All these psychological stages of the Action are calculated to maintain interest and hold

the audience in suspense up to the conclusion, by introducing the novelty of the subordinate matter every time. The five अर्थप्रकृतिs in alliance with the five अवस्थाs constitute the five सन्धिs or junctures of a play.

The five सन्धिs corresponding to the respective अर्थप्रकृतिs and अवस्थाs in their order are as follows—(1) मुखसन्धि is the *opening* (आरम्भ) of the action, where the seed (बीज) of the plot being sown, interest is awakened in the minds of spectators. (2) प्रतिमुखसन्धि (*progression*), which arises from the combination of बिन्दु and यत्न, is the sprouting of the seed or development of the plot owing to the introduction of a subordinate and disturbing element (बिन्दु). This element shows the concentrated effort (यत्न) of the characters and spectators to reach the goal. (3) गर्भसन्धि is the further *development* of the plot containing the element of पताका. Here the hope of attaining the fruit (प्राप्त्याशा) is aroused by introducing new subordinate matter (पताका) and by indicating possibilities of success. (4) विमर्श or अवमर्श सन्धि indicates a short *pause* or *check* in the action of the plot, on account of some unexpected obstacle or an episodical incident (प्रकरी), which being at last set aside, surety of attaining the fruit or result (नियताप्ति) is hinted at. (5) निर्वहणसन्धि signifies the *conclusion* (कार्य) of the plot brought about by the organization of several episodes of the drama with the main plot. It creates a *synthetic* and lasting impression on the

minds of spectators and shows the actual attainment of the fruit or result (फलागम). Thus all the सन्धिs serve to maintain the unity of the dramatic action by establishing organization between the minor and major parts of the plot. [भ. नाट्यशास्त्र, अ. २१; दशरूपक, प्र. १].

These अर्थप्रकृतिs, अवस्थाs and सन्धिs with their five respective sub-divisions, viz., the corresponding elements, stages and junctures can be thus represented in a tabular form:—

अर्थप्रकृतयः	१ बीजम्	२ बिन्दुः	३ पताका	४ प्रकरी	५ कार्यम्
अवस्थाः	१ आरम्भः	२ यत्नः	३ प्राप्त्याशा	४ नियताप्तिः	५ फलागमः
सन्धयः	१ मुखम् Opening	२ प्रतिमुखम् Progression	३ गर्भः Development	४ विमर्शः (अवमर्शः) Pause	५ निर्वहणम् (उपसंहृतिः) Conclusion

According to भरत each सन्धि, except the first consisting of *twleve* sub-divisions (सन्ध्यङ्गs) is to be subdivided into *thirteen,* so that all सन्ध्यङ्गs can be enumerated to be *sixty-four.** Detailed treatment of these sub-divisions is needless here. Suffice it to say that even those sub-divisions present a psychological aspect. All these अर्थप्रकृतिs, अवस्थाs and सन्धिs with their sixty-four sub-divisions have been laid down by भरत for the methodical

* The sub-divisions of सन्धिs according to the दशरूपक are— 12 + 13 + 12 + 13 + 14 = 64

representation of a drama. Strict adherence to these सन्धिs and their sub-divisions (सन्ध्यङ्गs) is not obligatory on dramatists, since slavish observance of rules or technique mars the originality of a dramatist or a poet, and obstructs the flight of his Imagination. भरत *intelligently allows* a dramatist sufficient discretion to write his play. For, he himself says in the नाट्यशास्त्र—

इत्येतानि यथासन्धि कार्याण्यङ्गानि रूपके ।
कविभिः कार्यकुशलै रसभावानवेक्ष्य तु ॥
सर्वाङ्गानि कदाचित्तु द्वित्रियोगेन वा पुनः।
ज्ञात्वा कार्यमवस्थां च योज्यान्यङ्गानि सन्धिषु ॥

—भ. नाट्यशास्त्रम्, २१।१०६–१०७

" Thus the poets skilled in dramatic composition should use in dramas the sub-divisions (सन्ध्यङ्गs) in proper relation to their respective सन्धिs; but they should use them with their *attention mainly to the predominant sentiments.* They may optionally utilize the sub-divisions of सन्धिs, either in their entirety or in their combinations of two or three; but they may do so with full knowledge of the *de'nouement* and psychological stages of the drama. "

It must, therefore, be noted that this methodology of सन्धिs and सन्ध्यङ्गs is not meant simply to exalt the *theory* of the dramatic science. In the successful composition and presentation of a play, i. e., in actual *practice*, it is meant to serve as a means to the chief end, which is the enhancement

of रस. This enhancement of रस might be psycholcgically termed 'awakening of curiosity' or 'heightening of interest' coupled with the clear comprehension of any subject dealt with. With the same purpose in view the author of the ध्वन्यालोक says as follows—

सन्धिसन्ध्यङ्गघटनं रसाभिव्यक्त्यपेक्षया।
न तु केवलया शास्त्रस्थितिसम्पादनेच्छया ॥

—ध्वन्यालोकः, ३।१२

"The combination of सन्धिs and सन्ध्यङ्गs, in the setting of a play, must be made not only with the view of conforming to the technique of dramaturgy or maintaining the dignity of that science, but mainly with the view of developing and manifesting the रसs in a successful manner."

The same valuable suggestions are applicable to the use of अलङ्कारs (figures), रीति (diction), and गुणs (excellences) in the composition of a drama and other varieties of poetry. A dramatist or a poet can, therefore, get full scope for his originality, wit, poetic ideas, constructive skill, etc, in spite of the minute details of those rules. All these thoughts hold good even in the science of teaching. A teacher likewise may conform to the technique of teaching, yet he must bear in mind that all this technique is a means to the 'interest' to be aroused among students in the subject dealt with. He should not slavishly follow the technique of teaching, but must have his eye fixed on *Interest*, so that he would get full scope for

the free exhibition of his tact, humour, clear treatment of his subject, and other factors of good teaching. The five सन्धिs are the actual method of dramatic demonstration through which a dramatist, actors and spectators have consecutively to pass according to the heightening of their emotions and sentiments. The principle of सन्धिs, therefore, may be resorted to, according to the rules of dramaturgy, as much by teachers as by dramatists and actors, when a predominantly emotional subject is to be demonstrated before a psychological group of students or spectators. In this respect, the plot (वस्तु) of a drama may correspond to the emotional subject to be taught, an actor to a teacher, spectators to students, and the five सन्धिs to the five steps of teaching. Thus the five सन्धिs can very well be turned into the five psychological steps of a 'literature' lesson, though we have not come across references, in ancient works, to their employment in teaching. It is not known for certain whether the सन्धिs were adopted as steps of teaching literature or not, when the emotional aspect was prominent. There is, however, no reason why we should not adopt these सन्धिs as *steps of teaching literature* or any subject worthy of being dealt with on the emotional level.

It is worthy of note in this respect that भरत's theory of रस was originally meant for the dramatic representation. Later literary critics like रुद्रभट्ट and आनन्दवर्धन, however, finding the predominant ele-

ment of रस common to the drama as well as poetry, have applied that theory without any modification to poetry and its composition. रुद्रभट्ट says in his शृङ्गारतिलक as follows—

प्रायो नाट्यं प्रति प्रोक्ता भरताद्यै रसस्थितिः ।
यथामति मयाप्येषा काव्यं प्रति निगद्यते ॥

—शृङ्गारतिलक, १।५

" Generally भरत and others have expounded the theory of रस with reference to the dramatic representation. I treat of it, as far as my power of judgment permits me, with reference to poetry."

When these facts are taken into account, it is no violation of the ancient literary principles, if the theory of junctures (सन्धिs) is made applicable to the theory and practice of teaching *literature* without changing in the least the original meanings of the words : मुख, प्रतिमुख, गर्भ, विमर्श and निर्वहण. It is obvious that the emotional teaching of literature involves the same psychological stages and junctures, which are in every way applicable to the interesting exposition of literature by the teacher before the ' psychological group ' of students.

Again भरत *enumerates six purposes of the* employment of सन्ध्यङ्गs (sub-divisions). Those purposes, though they are applicable to the composition and representation of the drama, are also worthy of being always borne in mind by a teacher while actually presenting the subject-matter to his students. The purposes are—

इष्टस्यार्थस्य रचना वृत्तान्तस्यानुपक्षयः ।
रागप्राप्तिः प्रयोगस्य गुह्यानां चैव गूहनम् ॥
आश्चर्यवदभिख्यानं प्रकाश्यानां प्रकाशनम् ।
अङ्गानां षड्विधं ह्येतदुक्तं शास्त्रे प्रयोजनम् ॥

—भ. नाट्यशास्त्रम्, २१।५३–५४

"(1) Arrangement of the subject-matter intended to be presented, (2) uninterrupted continuity of the topic, (3) maintenance of interest (राग) in the presentation, (4) concealment of the things that ought to be concealed, (5) addressing the audience in such a way that their curiosity or surprise would be aroused, and (6) disclosure of the things to be disclosed—these are the six purposes of the sub-divisions in this dramatic science." धनञ्जय, after reproducing the same six purposes of the sub-divisions in his दशरूपक (I. 55), gives the following valuable suggestions regarding the presentation of the subject-matter—

द्वेधा विभागः कर्तव्यः सर्वस्यापीह वस्तुनः ।
सूच्यमेव भवेत्किञ्चिद् दृश्यश्रव्यमथापरम् ॥
नीरसोऽनुचितस्तत्र संसूच्यो वस्तुविस्तरः ।
दृश्यस्तु मधुरोदात्तरसभावनिरन्तरः ॥

—दशरूपकम्, १।५६-५७

"The whole subject-matter should be divided into two parts. Some of it should be suggested by incidental reference, and the other should be witnessed and heard by the audience. Details of the subject-matter that are devoid of charm and propriety should be incidentally referred to; and what

is full of sweet and sublime emotions and sentiments should be presented in detail."

In the science of dramaturgy similar verses are found which can be applied to teaching without modifying their meanings. From all that has been said above it will be clear that classification of the subject-matter, nomenclature, definition, ascertainment of the relative worth of principal and subordinate elements, and organization of all the elements into a systematic or synthetic whole are the *distinguishing features of methodology,* which is not only applicable to the नाट्यशास्त्र but is of wider application to all the शास्त्रs in India. Logic has particularly helped the development of the methodology by enunciating its principles of उद्देश (Enumeration), लक्षण (Definition) and परीक्षा (Examination), as we have already seen. The नाट्यशास्त्र besides methodically and psychologically setting forth its general *theory* concerns itself more with its actual *practice* on the stage. This is why it lays down principles for the organization of the subject-matter according to its essential and non-essential elements, and also for its beautiful presentation which would charm the minds of spectators. Those psychological principles are, therefore, applicable in many respects to the art of teaching, and give us valuable hints for the formulation of the theory of teaching according to the Hindu ideas, and for the use of that theory in actual practice.

Along this line of thought it is interesting to note how a new drama is acted between the Subject

(विषयी, द्रष्टा) and the Object (विषय, दृश्य) in interchanging their places and assuming different roles. The author of Dramaturgy like भरत, who is the 'Subject', assumes the role of a teacher in relation to the psychological group of dramatists, who are objectified by him, while a dramatist who was formerly objectified becomes now the 'Subject' and assumes the role of a teacher in relation to the *Dramatis Personae*. On the other hand, the *Dramatis Personae* while acting a drama become the 'Subject' and assume the role of teachers in relation to the spectators, who are for some time objectified into a psychological group. The spectators while passively witnessing a drama and enjoying the रस are transformed into the 'Subject' and objectify the actors and the whole dramatic performance. If we thus find that all this is a play or communion between the 'Subject' and the 'Object', and if 'Interest' (राग or रस) is heightened in the *psychic union of the 'Subject' and the 'Object'*, there need be no objection if we extend the same relation of the 'Subject' and the 'Object' to the teacher and the taught respectively. It may be added here that a teacher assumes, or ought to assume, the role of an actor in relation to his students, who are objectified by him and who play the part of the audience or a psychological group. A teacher teaching a drama or any emotional subject must, therefore, possess some dramatic sense for making his teaching interesting and instructive; and for this purpose he may follow some dramatic principles in practice,

and adopt the पञ्चसन्धिs in the drama as the five steps of teaching literature.

Just as the teacher and the taught are required, for the study of intellectual subjects (शास्त्रs), to adopt five or three steps of the 'Logical Method' as previously indicated, similarly the teachers may take the five सन्धिs of the drama to be a distinguishing feature of the 'Psychological Method', and may resort to them for the teaching of Literature and other emotional subjects to advanced students in an interesting and instructive manner. All this will clearly show that the Hindu thinkers took recourse not only to the 'Logical Method' but also to the 'Psychological Method.' In other words, they based the presentation of their subjects on the findings of their own Logic as well as Psychology. The former has accepted Causal Relation, Categories, Inference and Joint Method of Agreement and Difference (अन्वय–व्यतिरेक) as the chief modes of thinking and reasoning, while the latter suggests principles of education which are based on the mind of the Individual as well as of the Group.

III THE METHODS OF LOGIC (न्याय)

The distinction between the 'Psychological Method' and the 'Logical Method' may be noted here. The Psychological Method is the practical application of the general principles of psychology,

which deals with the phenomena or the actual working of the three aspects of the mind, viz., Affection, Cognition and Conation. In this sense psychology is a theoretical science inasmuch as it is concerned with mental states as they actually exist and develop in Nature. Psychology, however, forms the basis of practical sciences, which regulate and lead the powers of the mind to a worthy goal and help the development of Personality, which is a complete whole of affection, cognition and conation. The practical sciences are, for instance, Education, Aesthetics, Logic, etc., out of which Education is concerned with the sublimation of all the mental powers and is thus closely related to psychology. Aesthetics and literary criticism are prominently related to the affective aspect of the mind, and their goal is the attainment of Aesthetic Delight. Logic, on the other hand, is based on the cognitive aspect of the mind, and its goal is to train us in the art of correct thinking. It will be then clear that the practical approach made to a subject after taking into account the three aspects of the mind may be called the 'Psychological Method', while the purely cognitive approach to a subject may be termed the 'Logical Method'.

This does not, of course, mean that the Psychological Method is illogical or that the Logical Method is unpsychological. Although both are complementary to each other, yet according to the growing understanding of a young learner the Psychological Method, which is based on the natural growth or evolution of the three aspects

of the mind, is more effective than the Logical Method, which, being concerned mainly with generalized or ideal thought, becomes abstract and unintelligible. The learning process of a child according to psychology continues through the stages of sense-perception, repeated observation (भूयोदर्शन) of particulars, recognition of similarity and contrast, recapitulation of former experience, organization of all facts, and generalization. In short, he starts from the particular to the general through the process of Induction. Here the Psychological Method culminates, and must culminate, in the Logical Method, for the purpose of giving a finished form to the knowledge imparted and to the method of its imparting. Induction must be verified by Deduction and recapitulation, or analysis must be followed by synthesis. In other words, *the best method will be analytico-synthetic* rather than purely analytic or synthetic. A young learner who has reached the stage of generalization may, if he chooses, dispense with the Psychological Method and resort to the Logical one. It must, however, be remembered that even in the case of novices advanced in age Psychological Method, which is concrete and interesting on account of its appeal to emotions and imagination, serves its purpose more than the Logical Method.

Though Logic, which is related to cognition, may form a branch of psychology, it has established its independence as a separate science, and also helps psychology in return. It not only systematizes

psychology but from the cognitive point of view analyses any subject into principal and subordinate parts and organizes it *into a system* or united whole. *This is why Logic and the Logical Method* have occupied a more prominent place than psychology among all sciences even from ancient times in the East as well as in the West. Another reason of the prominence of Logic is that it is primarily concerned with correct thinking or valid knowledge (प्रमा) and secondarily with *incorrect thinking* or fallacies as well as forms of invalid knowledge (अप्रमा), so that we should avoid or dispel the latter and resort only to the former; while psychology deals with correct as well as incorrect processes of thinking, feeling and willing as they actually take place in our mind. Logic does *not, therefore, deal with ' thought '* as it *is* but expresses *its thoughts about the ideal* and general thought or ' thought ' as it *ought to be*, by regulating its natural process. It analyses 'thought' into Concept, Judgment and Inference, clarifies relations between the *objects of knowledge* (प्रमेय) and *their symbols (words etc.) or between a thought and another thought, demonstrates* the ideal process or method of acquiring valid knowledge by stating the instruments or *means of valid knowledge* (प्रमाणs), and lays down rules for the *attainment of Truth*, which is the common goal of all *sciences*. *For this purpose it resorts to the classification* of things and *nomenclature* suited to particular aims, and lays down a *procedure*, which is either deductive or inductive. When the various

relations between the objects of valid knowledge and their symbols are made known through this procedure, explanation of a subject assumes a methodical and scientific aspect. Although Logic is generally a practical science, its treatment of the laws of concept, judgment and inference forms its theory or the first part, and the knowledge of that theory leads us to its second part, viz., the *scientific theory of method* or *methodology*. This methodology of Logic is of universal application to all branches of human knowledge, viz., psychology, metaphysics, linguistics, chemistry, medical science, education, etc., since it enables us to expound those subjects in a methodical way. In other words, methodology maintains clarity of thought by distinguishing between the primary and secondary elements of a subject and by organizing those elements into a proportioned whole or a System. Moreover, it develops critical insight so as to enable us to discard fallacious reasoning or invalid knowledge and accept valid knowledge alone. The Logical Method may, therefore, be called the 'scientific' or 'critical' method of arriving at correct conclusions for the attainment of Truth.

'Truth' is that which remains unchanged under varying circumstances; and a new fact, that is found to be consistent with it, assumas the form of truth. The method, therefore, that facilitates approach to that truth after making us discard the non-essential and ascertain the essential is the best method. This method comprises the processes of logical *analysis* and *synthesis* of observed facts

that conduce to the systematic knowledge of a particular subject. Analysis involves the separation of the individual parts of a united whole through the processes of observation, experiment, guarded use of hypothesis, analogy, isolation of necessary facts from unnecessary ones, establishment of a law owing to the causal relation revealed, and the act of connecting this law with the universal law of wider generality. This scientific process of analysis, through which we arrive at the universal from the particular, is otherwise called 'Induction'. On the other hand, if we, after assuming the existence of the universal law, apply it to particular facts, we have to resort to the synthesis of particulars or parts into a systematized whole, on account of the common relation of the parts. This is otherwise called ' Deduction ' or the method of starting from the universal to the particular. Bacon and Mill discard this deductive procedure by saying that it adds nothing new to our knowledge, and establish the Inductive Method as the only Scientific Method. It must, however, be noted that Induction and Deduction, or analysis and synthesis, are both complementary to each other. For, mere analysis of facts cannot lead us to the organization and reconstruction of parts, unless we have some idea of the whole; while it is not possible to systematize the whole unless we fully know the parts and their relations. Analysis serves its purpose best when the parts or constituent elements of a fact can be synthesized and reconstructed into their original whole, just as the separation of the parts of a clock serves its

purpose when those several parts are reconstructed into the original clock. Analysis is interested in the concrete reality of particular facts, while synthesis is concerned with the abstract generality of the universals. Synthesis verifies the hypothesis in the light of the universal law and fills in the gaps left by analysis. Thus when synthesis or deduction is combined with analysis or induction, it becomes a sound foundation for the advancement of knowledge. It is the business of Logic to deal with both these procedures, which in their combined form supply us with a complete *scientific explanation,* and which may be designated as the 'Logical Method.'

The completeness or incompleteness of synthesis will depend upon the more or less perfect knowledge gained about a subject. If the universal laws derived from analysis can be applied without contradiction (व्यभिचार) to new cases, the synthesis may be said to be almost perfect and the scientific explanation of the truth aimed at would be complete in the same proportion. When we thus derive one truth from another either through induction or deduction, we have invariably to resort to *inference,* which is one of the chief features of the Logical Method. If the conclusion is inevitably arrived at after following the natural sequence of all the premises, the process of inference becomes complete, and a particular principle or doctrine is said to be establishad, inasmuch as it is supported by sound reasons (हेतु) in favour of it. Analysis dis-

closes to us the mutual relations of particular facts and leads us through inductive inference to the universals, which supply a sound basis for deductive inference or synthesis.

When all the universals or general truths are incorporated by synthesis in a united whole so as to form an organization of parts with parts, and of subordinate parts with the principal part on account of relations existing among all, they develop into a system or शास्त्र, which facilitates inference or the process of reasoning. The idea of the whole then helps us to understand the parts related to it, while the knowledge of the parts gives us the idea of the whole, as the parts are related to it. It is only the *relations* existing between the parts and the whole that make us understand the nature of both of them. Demonstration of the *causal relation* of a part with another part, of a part with the whole, or of a new principle with the already existing system necessarily involves inference and is called 'scientific explanation.' The scientific explanation becomes perfect when it is consistent with truth, when it is supported by laws underlying Nature, and when it can find a proper place in a synthetic system. If 'science' means 'exact and systematized knowledge,' the scientific explanation must stand the test of truth and must ensue as a necessary consequence or uncontradicted conclusion from the previously accumulated knowledge.

It will be found from what has been said above that Methodology, which is a part of Logic, supplies

us with the rules of method which ought to be followed for the adoption of a systematic procedure in the investigation and treatment of any branch of knowledge. *Analysis* of a subject into major and minor parts and *synthesis* of all the parts into a united whole are, therefore, the general features of the method to be adopted. *The first rule of method then is distinctness and unity of purpose or aim,* which ought to be constantly kept in view for lending unity to the subject-matter and for analysing and organizing the subject-matter in the light of that unity. *The second rule is the ascertainment of the starting-point.* This rule includes (1) the correct and complete comprehension of facts through direct observation and indirect testimony, (2) interpretation and explanation of individual facts by relating them to the universal law, (3) demonstration of the *relation* existing among universal laws, (4) application of those laws in new spheres, (5) subordination of those laws to more universal laws and (6) mental construction of an organized body of knowledge. In all this process it is necessary to proceed with caution and graded steps.

The four famous rules of method laid down by Descartes for his own guidance convey the same purport and are as follows—

"The *first,* never to accept anything for true which I did not clearly know to be such; that is to say, carefully to avoid precipitancy and prejudice, and to comprise nothing more in my judgment than what was presented to my mind so clearly and distinctly as to exclude all ground of doubt.

" The *second*, to divide each of the difficulties under examination into as many parts as possible, and as might be necessary for its adequate solution.

" The *third*, to conduct my thoughts in such order that, by commencing with objects the simplest and easiest to know, I might ascend by little and little, and, as it were, step by step, to the knowledge of the more complex; assigning in thought a certain order even to those objects which in their own nature do not stand in a relation of antecedence and sequence.

" And the *last*, in every case to make enumerations so complete, and reviews so general, that I might be assured that nothing was omitted. "*

In short, " The essence of all the rules may be summed up in the directions to make sure of our starting-point, to know the end we wish to attain, and to go from the starting-point to that end by orderly and consecutive steps, each of which is seen in its true relation to all the rest of the enquiry. "†

All these rules of methodology laid down by the Western Logic are applicable not only to education but to the investigation into any system or branch of science. Almost the same rules of methodology are found in the Indian Logic (न्याय), which bears a striking resemblance to the Western Logic, not on occount of mutual borrowing, but on account of the sameness of the human mind every-

*See Descartes, Discourse on Method, Part II, pp. 15, 16.

†An Intermediate Logic, by Welton and Monahan.

where, and the same process of reasoning from the universal to the particular or from the particular to the universal. All the orthodox and heterodox systems of philosophy in India have accepted the general principles of reasoning or laws of thought set forth by the न्याय system as a means of methodical approach to the truths aimed at in their respective systems. Although the वेदान्तिन्s generally show the futility of logic in the realization of ब्रह्मन् or the ultimate reality†, they employ the logical terminology and 'Inference' in their argumentation to such a degree that many sentences in the भाष्य of शङ्कराचार्य, for instance, can be easily turned into the form of a syllogism. The later Vedant works like the भामती, the अद्वैतसिद्धि and the वेदान्तपरिभाषा are prominently couched in the language of the न्याय system, and prove, on the empirical plane (व्यावहारिक सत्ता), the वेदान्त doctrines in the light of the प्रमाणs (means of knowledge) propounded by the न्याय. Thus the Indian Logic is much similar to the Western Logic in the matter of the general acceptance of its methodology by other Indian systems.

Another point of similarity between the Western and Eastern Logic is the close correspondence of their syllogisms, which are a developed form of the 'Dialectic Method' or the method of dialogue used before their coming into being. Just as

† See the ब्रह्मसूत्र 'तर्काप्रतिष्ठानादप्यन्यथानुमेयमिति चेदेवमप्यविमोक्षप्रसङ्गः' (2. 1-11) and the शाङ्करभाष्य thereon.

Aristotle's syllogism is a systematized form of the 'Dialectic Method' used by his predecessors like the Sophists, Socrates and Plato (in his 'Dialogues'), so गौतम's five-membered syllogism, which was reduced to that of three members by the later नैयायिकs, is the development of the *Dialectic Method* used before him in the ancient debates held in sacrificial sessions and philosophical assemblies (परिषद्s). This method of dialogue is sufficiently *exemplified in the* उपनिषद्s and *corroborated by the* rules of debate (सम्भाषाविधि) collected in the चरकसंहिता (अ. ८, विमानस्थान). The *method of dialogue*, of which the logical syllogism is a finished form, is necessarily a *method of questions and answers going* on between the पूर्वपक्षिन् and the सिद्धान्तिन् or between the teacher and the taught. Thus every premise of the Indian syllogism is an answer to a question asked by an opponent or a student. For instance, the hackneyed syllogism of the न्याय implies questions and may be expressed in the form of questions and answers as follows : "किमुच्यते ? पर्वतो वह्निमान् । कस्मात्? धूमवत्त्वात् । किमुदाहरणम् ? यो यो धूमवान् स स वह्निमान्, यथ महानसः । किं तर्हि ? वह्निव्याप्यधूमवानयं पर्वतः । किं सिद्धम् ? पर्वतो वह्निमान् ।" This method was much used in ancient times for oral discussions and for the teaching of a subject, and has got its *written evidence in the commentary literature* on शास्त्रs and काव्यs, as will be shown later on. Moreover, पक्ष, साध्य and हेतु, the constituents of the Indian syllogism correspond respectively to the minor term, major term and the middle term of

Aristotle's syllogism. The Indian syllogism is not, however, a process of purely deductive inference like that of Aristotle, but is a process of deductive-inductive inference, since the 'उदाहरण' in it supplies us with the particular, observed facts leading us to the general proposition, as previously indicated. Thus the Indian Logic and the Western Logic are identical in the treatment of *inference, definitions, classification, and even inductive procedure.*

Although the Indian Logic (न्याय) deals incidentally with psychology, theory of knowledge, language, theology, etc., the greater part of it is properly concerned with the cognitive aspect of the mind, since it is usually detailed under the general heading of बुद्धि or Reason, which is the instrument of valid knowledge (प्रमा) as distinguished from invalid knowledge (अप्रमा). The purpose or aim (प्रयोजन) of all valid knowledge distinctly kept in view by the न्याय, as it is done by all Indian systems, is emancipation (मोक्ष). It is, therefore, the task of the न्याय principally to approach valid knowledge or truth which leads to मोक्ष. गौतम, therefore, proposes to treat of this valid knowledge through the enumeration (उद्देश) and classification of sixteen topics (पदार्थ)*, of which the first two, viz., प्रमाण (means of valid knowledge) and प्रमेय (objects of valid

---

* प्रमाण–प्रमेय–संशय–प्रयोजन–दृष्टान्त–सिद्धान्त–अवयव–तर्क–निर्णय–वाद–जल्प–वितण्डा–हेत्वाभास–च्छल–जाति–निग्रहस्थानानां तत्त्वज्ञानान्निःश्रेयसाधिगमः ॥ —न्या. सू. १–१–१

knowledge) are the most important. Again, between these two topics 'प्रमाण' *is held to be more important,* since it facilitates methodical approach to knowledge; and this accounts for a large portion devoted to the treatment of प्रमाणs in later works on the न्याय. The establishment of the प्रमेय through the *detailed discussion of the* प्रमाणs is the common feature of all scientific systems in India and it was adopted by them from the methodology of the न्याय, though there are conflicting views among them as regards the number of प्रमाणs and प्रमेयs. The number of प्रमाणs varies with every system, in spite of the general acceptance of the four प्रमाणs of the नैयायिकs by the important Indian systems. The प्रमाणs recognized by the Indian systems are as follows-(1) The चार्वाकs accept only *one* प्रमाण, viz., प्रत्यक्ष (Perception). (2) The वैशेषिकs and बौद्धs accept *two* प्रमाणs, viz., प्रत्यक्ष (Perception) and अनुमान (Inference). (3) The साङ्ख्यs accept *three*, viz., प्रत्यक्ष, अनुमान and शब्द (Verbal testimony). The जैनs seem to accept the same प्रमाणs though their classification of प्रमाणs is based on a different principle. (4) The नैयायिकs recognize *four*, viz , प्रत्यक्ष, अनुमान, शब्द and उपमान (Comparison). (5) The प्राभाकर-मीमांसकs recognize *five*, viz., प्रत्यक्ष, अनुमान, शब्द, उपमान and अर्थापत्ति (Presumption). (6) The भाट्टमीमांसकs sanction *six*, viz., प्रत्यक्ष, अनुमान, शब्द, उपमान, अर्थापत्ति and अनुपलब्धि (Non-apprehension). The वेदान्तिन्s accept the same प्रमाणs on the phenomenal plane (व्यावहारिक सत्ता) for the establishment of their doctrines, as

is evidenced by the वेदान्तपरिभाषा. Moreover, they add अनुभवप्रमाण (Transcendental realization) as the foremost of all from the point of view of the Absolute State (पारमार्थिकसत्ता). (7) The पौराणिकs accept *eight*, viz., प्रत्यक्ष, अनुमान, शब्द, उपमान, अर्थापत्ति, अनुपलब्धि, सम्भव (Probability) and ऐतिह्य (Tradition). $ The नैयायिकs, however, establish only four प्रमाणs, since they show that 'ऐतिह्य' can be included in शब्द and अर्थापत्ति, सम्भव and अनुपलब्धि in अनुमान. The definitions (लक्षण) and critical examination of those four प्रमाणs and more particulary of Inference (अनुमान) occupy a major part of the न्याय system. For, it is said that a thing or principle can be established by definitions and means of proof and not by a mere statement (न हि प्रतिज्ञामात्रेण वस्तुसिद्धिः। लक्षणप्रमाणाभ्यां वस्तुसिद्धिः), or that the establishment of an object of knowledge depends upon the *means* of knowledge (मानाधीना मेयसिद्धिः). The नैयायिकs have shown critical acumen and power of minute analysis in the enumeration (उद्देश) and classification of categories and their subdivisions, in the definitions (लक्षण) of the same and in the examination (परीक्षा) of those definitions, which are demonstrated to be correct after indicating the propriety of each word in them

$ प्रत्यक्षमेकं चार्वाकाः कणादसुगतौ पुनः। अनुमानं च तच्चापि साङ्ख्याः शब्दं च ते अपि ॥१७॥ न्यायैकदेशिनोऽप्येवमुपमानं च केचन। अर्थापत्त्या सहैतानि चत्वार्याह प्रभाकरः ॥१८॥ अभावषष्ठान्येतानि भाट्टा वेदान्तिनस्तथा। सम्भवैतिह्ययुक्तानि तानि पौराणिका जगुः ॥१९॥

—सुरेश्वराचार्यकृतं मानसोल्लासवार्तिकम्, द्वितीयोल्लासः ।

and avoiding the faults of अव्याप्ति (non-pervasion), अतिव्याप्ति (over-extension) and असम्भव (non-existence). Examination (परीक्षा) includes also the establishment of the existence or non-existence of things or categories by applying the tests of four proofs (प्रमाण). This *three-fold logical method of exposition* is not only employed throughout all the न्याय works, but is adopted by other schools of thought for the systematic treatment of their respective tenets.

Thus the later नैयायिकs focussed their attention only on the theory of proofs (प्रमाणs) to the exclusion of the remaining fifteen topics of गौतम, and accepting the seven 'वैशेषिक' categories (पदार्थ) with their subdivisions, as a complete and minute analysis or classification of things in the universe, they included in them the sixteen topics of गौतम.* Now the seven categories of the वैशेषिकs are द्रव्य (Substance), गुण (Quality), कर्मन् (Action), सामान्य (Generality), विशेष (Particularity), समवाय (Inherence) and अभाव (Negation). These categories have further been subdivided into *nine* द्रव्यs, *twenty-four* गुणs, *five* forms of कर्मन्, *two* kinds of सामान्य, innumerable विशेषs, *one* समवाय, and *four* kinds of अभाव. Those categories with their subdivisions have been more or less accepted by other Indian systems as the starting-point of

* सर्वेषां पदार्थानां यथायथमुक्तेष्वन्तर्भावात्सप्तैव पदार्था इति सिद्धम् ।

—तर्कसङ्ग्रह, ७०.

their speculations, and can most favourably compare with Aristotle's categories. It may incidentally be remarked here that even the साङ्ख्यs, like वैशेषिकs, have attempted a complete classification of things in the universe. Their twenty-five categories, which mark graded stages in the psychological and physical evolution of the universe, and which can also favourably compare with the 'Evolution Theory' in the West, have generally influenced other Indian systems. They have been amalgamated with the Upanishadic philosophy, in spite of difference as to the Ultimate Reality, by philosophers like शङ्कराचार्य as the starting-point of their philosophical enquiry.$ It can, therefore, be said that along with the वैशेषिकs and the नैयायिकs the साङ्ख्यs also have contributed much to the methodical treatment of शास्त्रs.

In connection with the etymological explanation of the word 'प्रमाण' as 'प्रमायाः करणम्' (the instrument of valid knowledge), the word 'करण' (instrument) is explained in the न्याय system as 'व्यापारवदसाधारणं कारणम्' (a peculiar and operative cause), and the theory of Causal Relation, which prominently presents a scientific aspect to the explanation of phenomena, is further detailed. The *cause* is defined in the न्याय as that which invariably and immediately precedes its effect and which is not proved to be a superfluous and accidental circumstance; while the *effect* is that which

$ येन त्वंशेन न विरुध्येते तेनेष्टमेव साङ्ख्ययोगस्मृत्योः सावकाशत्वम्।
—ब्र. सू. भा. २–१–३

tional concomitance (उपाधिविधुरं नियतं साहचर्यम्) between two phemomena, one of which is the sign or ground of inference (लिङ्ग, हेतु) like 'smoke' and the other is the thing to be inferred (साध्य) like 'fire'. The relation of invariable concomitance between the हेतु (व्याप्य) and the साध्य (व्यापक) must, therefore, be a natural one (स्वाभाविक), that is, based on the uniformity of Nature, and must be free from conditions (उपाधि) like the contact of wet fuel (आर्द्रेन्धन-संयोग) or contradictory facts (व्यभिचार). We are then enabled to ascertain the अन्वयव्याप्ति viz., 'Wherever there is smoke there is fire' (यत्र यत्र धूमस्तत्र तत्र वह्निः) and the व्यतिरेकव्याप्ति viz., 'Wherever there is the absence of fire, there is the absence of smoke' (यत्र वह्न्यभावस्तत्र धूमाभावः). In other words, the observation of agreement in presence as well as agreement in absence between the हेतु (middle term) and साध्य (major term) is necessary for the purpose of ascertaining व्याप्ति.

This व्याप्ति or generalization is derived from the repeated observation (भूयोदर्शन) of innumerable *particular cases* where smoke and fire co-exist or are associated. But the repeated observation of many particular cases of the co-existence of smoke and fire will be inadequate, if in only one case that association is contradicted (व्यभिचरित). The observation of the concomitance (साहचर्य) of smoke and fire must, therefore, be strengthened by the non-observation or absence of a

contrary instance (व्यभिचारादर्शन), where that association is violated. Thus repeated *observation of particular facts* through direct perception enables us to discover the co-existence (साहचर्य) of two phenomena, which being *invariably* and *uninterruptedly* experienced, lead us to the knowledge of their uniformity. When such particular uniformities are known by us, we begin to believe that there is a *fixed* order of things in Nature, and arrive at the wider laws of Uniformity (स्वाभाविकसम्बन्ध) and Causation (कार्यकारण-सम्बन्ध). This belief in uniformity and causation is strengthened by the apprehension of agreement between two phenomena in their presence and absence (अन्वयव्यतिरेक) supported by the non-apprehension of contradiction (व्यभिचाराग्रह). But if the observation of *all* the particulars of a phenomenon is not possible, how are we enabled to reach generalization from a few particulars ? The नैयायिकs answer this question by saying that the idea of generality (सामान्यप्रत्यासत्ति), which is really of the nature of immediate inference, is naturally aroused in us by the law of association, as soon as we perceive an individual. No sooner do we perceive an individual cow (गोव्यक्ति) than we realize the class-conception of the cow (गोत्वजाति). It is, therefore, possible to pass from particulars to the general through the *inductive* process, if there is the absence of contradiction (व्यभिचारविरह), which is also determined by means of repeated observation. Repeated observation alone, however, can-

in mind we make a hypothetical statement 'यदि पर्वतो वह्निमान् न स्यात् तर्हि स धूमवानपि न स्यात्'. Thus we purposely say 'पर्वतो धूमाभाववान्, वह्न्यभाववत्त्वात्' by resorting to the व्यतिरेकव्याप्ति 'यत्र यत्र वह्न्यभावस्तत्र तत्र धूमाभावः'. But the conclusion 'पर्वतो धूमाभाववान्' cannot be true, since it is contradictory to the actually observed fact of the presence of smoke on the mountain. If the opponent persists in his own statement 'पर्वतो वह्न्यभाववान्', he is asked to point out an example wherein smoke can exist without fire. Of course, as there is causal relation between smoke and fire, the opponent can obviously supply no example wherein smoke and fire do not coexist, and has to acknowledge the absurdity of his own statement 'पर्वतो वह्न्यभाववान्'. He is thus obliged to accept the truth of the व्यतिरेकव्याप्ति 'यत्र यत्र वह्न्यभावस्तत्र तत्र धूमाभावः' and indirectly to consent to the original proposition 'पर्वतो वह्निमान्'.

It must be remembered that this method of confutation (तर्क) does not directly establish the व्याप्ति, but helps us in proving the absence of a contradictory fact, by dispelling our doubts regarding a condition (उपाधि) or contradiction (व्यभिचार), and by strengthening our knowledge of coexistence (साहचर्य) which is apprehended by repeated observation. Thus 'तर्क', in which the principles of Causation and Uniformity are applied, is a method of the deductive verification of induction. Though तर्क is based on false assumption, it assists us in arriving

at valid conclusions, which are instrumental to valid knowledge (प्रमा). तर्क is particularly useful where the अन्वयव्याप्ति is not applicable and where a philosophical topic beyond our limited intellect can be explained only by a negative proof (व्यतिरेक). This तर्क, which is based on false assumption, is of five kinds, viz., आत्माश्रय (*Ignoratio elenchi*), अन्योन्याश्रय (dilemma), चक्रक (arguing in a circle), अनवस्था (*regressus ad infinitum*) and प्रमाणबाधितार्थप्रसङ्ग (*reductio ad absurdum*), of which the last has been detailed above.

It has been noted above that the व्याप्ति must be invariable and unconditional, just as the causal relation must be invariable and unconditional. This common feature of both will lead one perhaps to think that every व्याप्ति is based on the causal relation. In the particular example of smoke and fire the invariable concomitance of both can be shown to depend on the causal relation. But the नैयायिकs think that the causal relation between two phenomena is not quite necessary for every व्याप्ति, and that it is sufficient for the establishment of the व्याप्ति to know the concomitance of two phenomena without a contradictory fact. For instance, the invariable concomitance of the rise of the moon and the tide of the ocean is not necessarily based on the causal relation between the two, but depends on our general belief in the *uniformity of Nature*. This belief in *probability* which amounts to certainty makes us ascertain the invariable concomitance

of the two phenomena. It may then be said that व्याप्ति depends as much on the principle of the Uniformity of Coexistence as it depends on the principle of Causation. This is somewhat different from, and more comprehensive than, Mill's Method of Agreement and Difference which is based simply on causation.

It will then be seen that the process of ascertaining the व्याप्ति or generalization, as described in the न्याय system, is that of pure *Induction.* The generalization thus reached serves as a basis for a further deductive inference (अनुमान) which is an instrument of 'judgment' (अनुमिति). Before we arrive at this अनुमिति through the deductive inference (अनुमान, परामर्श), we have to undergo mainly three mental stages. The *first* stage involves the repeated observation of smoke in the kitchen, ascertainment of invariable concomitance or generalization through the knowledge of coexistence, non-observation of a contradiction and approach to a mountain. The *second* stage consists of the observation of smoke on the mountain and a doubt about the presence of fire on it. At the *third* stage there is the recollection of the generalization already ascertained, and the knowledge of smoke coexisting with fire on the mountain in relation to the generalization. This knowledge of smoke at the third stage is called 'consideration of a sign' (परामर्श or लिङ्गपरामर्श), from which arises the inference immediately leading to the 'judgment' (अनुमिति). [तर्कसङ्ग्रह, 41].

Thus *Indian Logic propounds the main principles of general methodology, which being actually applied to the other* शास्त्रs *lends a scientific aspect to them.* Indian logicians, however, do not seem to mention 'the experiment' along with repeated observation. Though no definite reference to the Experimental Method can be found in the न्यायवैशेषिक system, it is highly probable that experiments were actually made for the purpose of ascertaining the properties of the ingredients of a compound in the medical and chemical sciences in India. Although Indian Logic does not deal with the Experimental Method, yet it may be remarked that the general methodology, propounded by it, is *thoroughly scientific and critical* even from the Western point of view. In spite of individual differences in their tenets, other Indian systems like the व्याकरण, the मीमांसा, the वेदान्त etc., have found this methodology of the न्याय worthy of general acceptance, and have practically applied it to the methodical exposition of their respective principles. This, doubtless, proves that the modern critical or scientific methods were not non-existent in India as the advocates of Western learning remark, and that the Hindus carried on their investigations into any subject thoroughly on a rational and scientific basis, though they never lost sight of the limitations of Reason in transcendental matters.

With respect to the critical and scientific outlook of the Hindu thinkers it may be added that all

systems of thought in ancient India, orthodox as well as heterodox, try to approach Truth or valid knowledge (प्रमा–यथार्थज्ञान) by resorting to the valid proofs or *means of knowledge* (प्रमाणs), *causal relation, repeated observation, inference, etc.* How, then, can they be said to be uncritical ? The ancient Indian systems of thought have been critical and scientific enough in their attitude towards valid knowledge, though the experiments made by them might not have been thorough and minute owing to scanty apparatus, in which respect the modern science has undoubtedly made astounding progress. With reference to the unbiassed attitude indispensable to a scientist it may be remarked that the modern scientists, who in season and out of season advocate this attitude, are themselves found to be biassed; while the ancient thinkers, in putting forth their own point of view and refuting others, generally express the objections (पूर्वपक्ष) of others with the veracity of a historian or a modern scientist, and give their rejoinders or conclusive view (सिद्धान्त) in a perfectly logical manner, as is exemplified by the शारीरसूत्रभाष्य of श्रीशङ्कराचार्य. To be unbiassed is certainly not to abandon one's particular point of view, which would be worthy of standing the test of the valid principles of logic; and faith in the validity of one's own arguments and tenets is scientific enough. The only proviso is that this validity must be demonstrated by valid proofs (प्रमाण); and in respect of this scientific attitude the ancient systems of thought are certainly not inferior to the modern ones. It

must, however, be acknowledged that modern sciences have gone ahead of the ancient ones on account of their thorough experiments, minute apparatus, and several other means.

IV THE COMMON LITERARY FORMS SUITED TO METHODOLOGY.

In connection with the general methodology of Logic, as detailed above, it is necessary to take into account the three main literary forms, which the Indian systems of thought have adopted for the purpose of methodical exposition, and which have, therefore, contributed to the development of methodology. The three literary forms adopted by almost all systems in India are: (1) the आकरग्रन्थs or the main sources of a system, (2) the वादग्रन्थs or learned disquisitions on the same, and (3) the प्रकरणग्रन्थs or graded manuals for beginners. The आकरग्रन्थs include the सूत्रs or aphorisms, the वार्तिकs or works explaining the सूत्रs and supplying their deficiencies, and the भाष्यs or original and detailed expositions of the सूत्रs. It is instructive to trace the development of those literary forms from the point of view of methodology.

The Vedic literature, which consists of the संहिताs, ब्राह्मणs, आरण्यकs, and उपनिषद्s grew to an enormous extent owing to the repeated oral discussions

held in learned assemblies and in sacrificial sessions. For the proper understanding and easy memorization of the main topics in this vast literature and in the oral discussions on it, it became essential to sum up those topics, which, being collected according to their subject-matter, were classified into six वेदाङ्गs or supplementary treatises on the Vedas, viz., (1) शिक्षा (Phonetics), (2) छन्दस् (Prosody), (3) कल्प (Ritual), (4) निरुक्त (Etymology), (5) व्याकरण (Grammar), and (6) ज्यौतिष (Astronomy). All these वेदाङ्गs, of which the शिक्षा, the निरुक्त and the व्याकरण are the branches of the linguistic science, have assumed the unique form of the सूत्रs or aphorisms, which are short and pithy sentences in prose synthesizing the scattered matter on a subject in a systematic form, and which taken collectively develop into a particular system of thought. Although those aphorisms can be easily memorized, and although clarity (असन्दिग्धत्व) is held to be their distinguishing mark, yet on account of their ambiguity at many places they cannot be fully understood without oral or written explanations. In ancient times, when oral teaching was predominant, those सूत्रs were first learnt by students, and the teachers then gave their detailed oral explanations, which in later times were turned into written commentaries or भाष्यs. The chief *characteristics of the* सूत्र*-style* are the abundance of the forms of nouns and noun-equivalents, scarcity of verbal forms, purposeful use of particles and case-forms like those of the

ablative or the instrumental, and long compounds, which all secured brevity of expression at the cost of clarity, and have immensely influenced Sanskrit Style in the later classical literature. In addition to the व्याकरणसूत्रs of पाणिनि all the six orthodox systems, namely, the साङ्ख्य, the योग, the न्याय, the वैशेषिक, the पूर्वमीमांसा and the उत्तरमीमांसा or वेदान्त and also the heterodox systems like those of the बौद्धs and the जैनs have resorted to this convenient सूत्र-style for the purpose of bringing all their tenets in a condensed form.

The oral explanations of the सूत्रs were later on followed by detailed written explanations or भाष्यs, which besides explaining the सूत्रs expressed the independent views of a commentator, and which incorporated the above characteristics of the सूत्र-style. Again, the भाष्यs account for the logical arrangement and consistency (सङ्गति) of the सूत्रs in topics (अधिकरण), sections (पाद), chapters (अध्याय) and the whole शास्त्र, and further deal generally with each अधिकरण,-which contains one or more सूत्रs,-after distinguishing clearly its five parts, viz. (1) Statement of a topic (विषय), (2) Doubt (संशय), (3) Objection (पूर्वपक्ष), (4) Conclusive answer (सिद्धान्त) and (5) Consistency of the topic with the preceding and succeeding ones (सङ्गति). It should be particularly noted here that the general principles of methodology relating to the function and analysis of individual words (पद), the interpreta-

tion of syntactical unity (वाक्य), and the validity of proofs or means of knowledge (प्रमाण) as laid down respectively by the व्याकरण, the मीमांसा and the न्याय are employed in the भाष्यs at every step, in order to give a complete exposition of a particular शास्त्र. Moreover, there are two main types of भाष्यs, viz., (1) those written in the form of *a dialogue or questions and answers*, and (2) those in the form of a *continuous lecture*. The first type generally comprises the भाष्य of पतञ्जलि on the व्याकरण, that of शबर on the मीमांसा and that of वात्स्यायन on the न्याय, and all of them are, as it were, written reproductions of actual oral discussions; while the second type in the form of a lecture is represented prominently by शङ्कराचार्य's वेदान्तसूत्रभाष्य, which shows a further development of Sanskrit Style.

The भाष्यs, which along with the सूत्रs and वार्तिकs are called 'आकरग्रन्थs', are generally followed by 'वादग्रन्थs' or learned disquisitions, which prominently employ the न्याय-terminology and indulge in the minute analysis and hair-splitting distinctions of concepts in order to fortify the tenets of their respective systems. The examples of such works are the परिभाषेन्दुशेखर, the शब्देन्दुशेखर, etc., in the व्याकरण; the शास्त्रदीपिका, the न्यायरत्न, etc., in the मीमांसा; the तत्त्वचिन्तामणि, the गदाधरी, etc., in the न्याय; and the अद्वैतसिद्धि, the खण्डनखण्डखाद्य, etc., in the वेदान्त. The वादग्रन्थs are generally followed by प्रकरणग्रन्थs or manuals which, without making any show of originality and

erudition, merely systematize in brief the tenets of a school in a graded manner, with the view of making them suit the undeveloped understanding of novices. The instances of such works are the सिद्धान्तकौमुदी, the lesser कौमुदीs, etc., in the व्याकरण; the आपदेवी, the अर्थसङ्ग्रह, etc., in the मीमांसा; the सिद्धान्त-मुक्तावलि, the तर्कसङ्ग्रह, etc., in the न्याय; and the पञ्चदशी, the वेदान्तसार, etc., in the वेदान्त. Numerous commentaries on all these types of works, nay, further commentaries on commentaries have come into existence, the ceaseless activity of commentators resulting generally in the simplification or clarification of the original work, or sometimes in making the explanation more difficult than the original! Every system of thought thus seems to have undergone those three broad stages of development, not of course according to the chronological sequence, but according to the sequence of the development of thought. From another point of view also this evolution of an Indian system may be marked through three stages. Thus the composition of the सूत्रs may be called the *first* stage of *Condensation*; the भाष्यs and वादग्रन्थs indicate the *second* stage of *Expansion*; and the प्रकरणग्रन्थs belong to the *third* stage of *Organization*. All this methodical activity was possible only because the exponents of every system placed a *distinct aim* before themselves, possessed a comprehensive *knowledge of the parts and the whole* of a subject, resorted to the *analysis* of their subject into main divisions and sub-divisions, and made a *logical arrangement* of their

topics so as to maintain *synthesis.* A point worthy of note is that the above literary activity of Condensation, Expansion and Organization necessarily presupposes a definite and pointed knowledge of the subjectmatter and of the efficacious methods of its presentation.

V THE METHODS OF GRAMMAR (व्याकरण)

We have so far seen how Logic with its theory of प्रमाणs and almost all Indian systems with their common literary forms have largely contributed to the development of General Methodology. It will now be advisable to observe how the व्याकरण with its theory of words (पद्) has helped that development. It will also be interesting to see how the व्याकरण has been influenced by the methodology of the न्याय and the मीमांसा in later times.

The function of grammar, in general, is to deal with the phenomenon of language as it actually exists and to formulate the laws underlying it. The fact worthy of note is that language always precedes grammar and is learnt by every one of us in its naturally synthetic form. When it thoroughly establishes itself, grammar begins its work of analysing language into sentences, sentences into several parts of speech, and words into their crude forms (प्रकृति) and affixes (प्रत्यय). The 'व्याकरण' is so called

because it seeks to analyse (व्याकृ) or derive words from their root-stems [व्याक्रियन्ते व्युत्पाद्यन्ते शब्दा अनेनेति व्याकरणम्]. The व्याकरण, however, is not merely a collection of *rules,* but in a wider sense it is a collection both of examples or words in language (लक्ष्य) and rules (लक्षण).* It has already been mentioned that the व्याकरण is known to be one of the six वेदाङ्गs, since it principally helps us to preserve the Vedas, to effect changes in the case-forms of words in them, to understand them, to know the functions of words and their meanings easily in a short time and to dispel all linguistic doubts.$ As the अष्टाध्यायी of पाणिनि deals both with the Vedic language (छन्दस्) and the Sanskrit speech (भाषा) current in his own time, it is held to be a sacred वेदाङ्ग as distinguished from other schools of grammar.

Before पाणिनि wrote his अष्टाध्यायी, older grammarians and other linguistic schools of the वेदाङ्गs, viz., शिक्षा (Phonetics) and निरुक्त (Etymology) had attempted to give the grammatical analysis of the Vedic language and derivation of words in it. For instance, the शिक्षा school of linguistics located, in the प्रातिशाख्यs and the शिक्षाs, the places of utterance in the mouth (स्थान) and the internal and external efforts (प्रयत्न) of producing sounds; dealt with the rules of correct pronunciation, articulation, and

* लक्ष्यलक्षणे व्याकरणम् । पातं. महाभाष्य, आ. १, वा. १४.

$ रक्षोहागमलघ्वसन्देहाः प्रयोजनम् । पातं. महाभाष्य, आ. १.

analysis of Vedic Collections (संहिता) into individual words (पद्); and brought into being the पद्पाठ, which is ascribed to शाकल्य. This analysis comprises rules for the separation and formation of the सन्धिs of nouns, verbs, prepositions and indeclinables in the Vedic verses, and anticipates the process of 'पदच्छेद' (separation of words) adopted in the later Sanskrit teaching. Again, the minute analysis of sounds and the phonetic theory of Indians compare favourably with the modern Phonetics in the West. Along with the शिक्षा school the attempts of the नैरुक्तs (Etymologists) to analyse Vedic words in the निघण्टुs (lists of words) into their crude form (प्रकृति) and affix (प्रत्यय) and to derive nouns from their root-stems can be seen in the निरुक्त of यास्क, who accepted the theory of शाकटायन, viz., 'All nouns can be derived from roots',† and gave the etymological explanation of Vedic words after classifying all words in language into four kinds, viz., nouns, verbs, prepositions and indeclinables, $ and distinguishing the current Sanskrit (भाषा) from the Vedic Sanskrit (छन्दस्).

पाणिनि availed himself of all these attempts of his predecessors and wrote his अष्टाध्यायी, treating in full of the current speech (भाषा) as well as the Vedic language (छन्दस्). It is worthy of note what

---

† तत्र नामान्याख्यातजानीति शाकटायनो नैरुक्तसमयश्च । (निरुक्त, १-१२-२). $ तद्यान्येतानि चत्वारि पदजातानि नामाख्याते चोपसर्गनिपाताश्च तानीमानि भवन्ति । (निरुक्त, १-१-८).

Max Muller says about पाणिनि : " The Grammatical system elaborated by native Grammarians, is in itself most perfect, and those who have tested पाणिनि's work will readily admit, that there is no Grammar in any language, that could vie with the wonderful mechanism of his eight books of Grammatical rules. " पाणिनि has divided about four thousand सूत्रs of his अष्टाध्यायी into eight chapters (अध्याय) of four sections (पाद) each. Although it is not possible to give in short a scheme of those सूत्रs, yet it may be said in general that पाणिनि has devoted his attention to the analysis of words (पदसंस्कार) into their stems (प्रकृति) and affixes (प्रत्यय), by dividing the two chief parts of a sentence into nouns along with nominal derivatives and verbs along with verbal derivatives, and by alternately dealing with those two parts. In this alternate treatment also he begins with a section on verbs and treats of सन्धिs generally in chapters VI and VIII. There is, however, no topical arrangement of the सूत्रs in the अष्टाध्यायी, and the subjectmatter which occurs in the form of incidental digressions or is distantly related to a topic in hand has been inserted in many अध्यायs for the sole purpose of securing brevity of expression. For, the joy experienced in the saving of even half a syllable in the wording of a सूत्र is likened by the grammarians to the joy caused by the birth of a son.$

$ अर्धमात्रालाघवेन पुत्रोत्सवं मन्यन्ते वैयाकरणाः। परि. शेखर, परि.

It should not, however, be supposed that there is no arrangement or method of any kind in the अष्टाध्यायी. It may be broadly remarked that पाणिनि arranged the sequence of his सूत्रs into अध्यायs and पादs after constantly keeping in view the law of interpretation (परिभाषा): "पूर्वपरनित्यान्तरङ्गापवादानामुत्तरोत्तरं बलीयः" (परिभाषेन्दुशेखर, परि० ३८), which is an amplification of the सूत्र 'विप्रतिषेधे परं कार्यम्' (सि. कौमुदी, १७५). All this means that if two सूत्रs of equal force come into conflict with each other, the सूत्र subsequent (पर) in order supersedes the former (पूर्व), a persistent (नित्य) सूत्र supersedes a subsequent (पर) सूत्र, an internal (अन्तरङ्ग) सूत्र supersedes a persistent सूत्र, and a special (अपवाद) सूत्र supersedes an internal सूत्र. In other words, नित्य, अन्तरङ्ग and अपवाद rules supersede a पर rule, अन्तरङ्ग and अपवाद rules supersede a नित्य rule, and an अपवाद rule supersedes even an अन्तरङ्ग rule. In short, each succeeding rule mentioned above possesses greater force than each preceding one in its due order. Thus पाणिनि arranges his सूत्रs into अध्यायs and पादs after fully considering where each of the above kinds of सूत्रs is to be placed. But in the case of special grammatical functions, which do not come within the purview of, or are opposed to, the above परिभाषा, he adopts a different plan. He makes two main divisions of the whole of the अष्टाध्यायी, which consists of thirty-two sections (पादs). The first division of seven chapters and one section or twenty-nine sections is called 'सपाद-

सप्ताध्यायी', and the second one of three sections is called 'त्रिपादी', which contains special grammatical functions. The सूत्र at the beginning of the त्रिपादी is 'पूर्वत्रासिद्धम्' (अष्टा॰ ८।२।१; सि. कौ., १२), which means that what follows this सूत्र up to the end is invalid or non-existent with respect to what precedes it. In other words, with respect to the application of the सूत्रs in the सपादसप्ताध्यायी the सूत्रs in the त्रिपादी are to be considered as invalid or non-existent, and even in the त्रिपादी a latter सूत्र is to be considered as non-existent with respect to all former सूत्रs.* This amounts to saying that even though the सूत्रs in the त्रिपादी are subsequent (पर) to सपादसप्ताध्यायी, they do not annul the previous (पूर्व) grammatical functions contained in the सपादसप्ताध्यायी. Thus the injunction laid down by the सूत्र 'पूर्वत्रासिद्धम्' is quite contrary to the injunction laid down in the above परिभाषा 'पूर्वपरनित्यान्तरङ्गापवादानामुत्तरोत्तरं बलीयः'. This is the broad outline according to which पाणिनि has arranged his सूत्रs in the अष्टाध्यायी.

Of the several devices used by पाणिनि in order to secure brevity of expression his invention of प्रत्याहारs (abbreviations) and अनुबन्धs or इत्s (indicatory letters) helping the formation of the प्रत्याहारs is one. He, therefore, with extraordinary originality and skill arranged vowels and consonants in the

---

* सपादसप्ताध्यायीं प्रति त्रिपाद्यसिद्धा त्रिपाद्यामपि पूर्वं प्रति परं शास्त्रमसिद्धं स्यात्। —सि. कौमुदी, १२

fourteen माहेश्वरसूत्रs or प्रत्याहारसूत्रs at the beginning of the अष्टाध्यायी in such a scientific order that the प्रत्याहारs formed from them should serve some grammatical function in an abbreviated form. It is due to this idea of the प्रत्याहारs that he coins new technical terms like 'अच्' and 'हल्' for vowels and consonants respectively. The अनुबन्धs or इत्s (indicatory letters) are useful in many other ways. For instance, they are applied to roots, affixes, etc., to denote their conjugation or पद; and the injunction or prohibition regarding गुण, वृद्धि, सम्प्रसारण, etc., in the formation of nouns (सुबन्त), verbs (तिङन्त), primary derivatives (कृदन्त) and secondary derivatives (तद्धितान्त) depends wholly on them.

Taking into account the nature of the अष्टाध्यायी and the scheme working in the mind of पाणिनि later grammarians have methodically classified all his सूत्रs into six varieties, which are indicated in the following verse—

संज्ञा च परिभाषा च विधिर्नियम एव च।
अतिदेशोऽधिकारश्च षड्विधं सूत्रलक्षणम्॥

The six varieties of पाणिनि's सूत्रs are—(1) संज्ञा or definitions, (2) परिभाषा or rules of interpretation, (3) विधि or injunctions (general rules), (4) नियम or restrictive rules, (5) अतिदेश or rules indicating extended application by analogy, and (6) अधिकार or governing rules. If *nomenclature* and *classification* are the chief features of *methodology*, it may

be stated that the grammarians too have followed it here.

(1) Out of the above six classes of rules the संज्ञासूत्रs define the technical terms † like वृद्धि, गुण, लोप, उपसर्ग, गति, निपात, टि, घु, etc., and briefly express their comprehensive sense, which ought to be always remembered in the study of grammar. Here the logical method of उद्देश, लक्षण and परीक्षा seems to have been unwittingly followed by पाणिनि, who had his own logic and scientific outlook, though the न्यायसूत्रs of गौतम had yet to come into existence. The संज्ञासूत्रs are helpful in understanding the meanings of technical words contained in the general rules or विधिसूत्रs, and are included in the first chapter of the अष्टाध्यायी.

(2) Secondly, the परिभाषासूत्रs are the general laws which are instrumental in the proper interpretation of the विधिसूत्रs and in the establishment of a consistent relation among them. A परिभाषा (परितो भाष्यते इति) comprehensively settles the meaning not only of one सूत्र but also of a group of सूत्रs that possess the common characteristics mentioned in it. For instance, the परिभाषासूत्र 'तस्मिन्निति निर्दिष्टे पूर्वस्य' (सि. कौ. ४०), which lays down a general law regarding the interpretation of a सूत्र with a word in the locative case, is applicable to the विधिसूत्र ' इको यणचि ' (सि. कौ. ४७) containing the word

† See the संज्ञाप्रकरण of the सिद्धान्तकौमुदी.

'अच्' in the locative as well as to all the सूत्रs that contain words in the locative. Thus the परिभाषाs like 'तस्मादित्युत्तरस्य' (सि. कौ. ४१), 'षष्ठी स्थानेयोगा' (सि. कौ. ३८), etc., which are actually given by पाणिनि in the form of सूत्रs help us to settle the meanings of many सूत्रs with the respective characteristics mentioned in them, and form syntactical unity (एकवाक्यता) with the विधिसूत्रs. Some of those परिभाषाs have been handed down to us in the form of सूत्रs by the predecessors of पाणिनि, and some are found as पाणिनि's सूत्रs in the first chapter of the अष्टाध्यायी.

The later grammarian, नागेश, collected in his परिभाषेन्दुशेखर 133 परिभाषाs, which had not been stated in the अष्टाध्यायी, and giving them a systematic form he classified them into three kinds, viz., वाचनिकी, ज्ञापकसिद्ध and न्यायसिद्ध. (i) वाचनिकी परिभाषाs are those that can be derived either from the sense of पाणिनि's सूत्रs or are found stated in the महाभाष्य of पतञ्जलि as the सूत्रs of older grammarians. (ii) ज्ञापकसिद्ध परिभाषाs are those that are suggested by the wording of the सूत्रs of पाणिनि, who seems to have known them to be in existence. (iii) Now न्यायसिद्ध परिभाषाs are sub-divided into (a) लौकिकन्यायसिद्ध, which are derived from the ordinary experience of people, and (b) शास्त्रीयन्यायसिद्ध, which are established by logical induction or by the scientific maxims (न्याय) of the मीमांसा. It must be noted that though the मीमांसासूत्रs of जैमिनि cannot be definitely said to have existed at the time of

पाणिनि, yet an oral tradition of the sacrificial cult and the rules for its interpretation did exist. पाणिनि might have, therefore, availed himself of that lore in formulating his परिभाषाs, which in later times increased in number and received a methodical form under the direct influence of the मीमांसाशास्त्र.

(3) Thirdly, a विधिसूत्र or a general rule lays down some new injunction which is not previously known by any other means. A विधिसूत्र is principal with reference to the other types of सूत्रs, which are its accessories. For instance, 'इको यणचि' (सि. कौ. ४७), 'एचोऽयवायावः' (सि. कौ. ६१), 'ह्रस्वनद्यापो नुट्' (सि. कौ.२०८), are विधिसूत्रs. निषेधसूत्रs or prohibitive rules may be included under the विधिसूत्रs, as they negatively enjoin something.

(4) Fourthly, a नियमसूत्र is one which restricts the sense of a विधिसूत्र or a general rule. For instance, 'रात्सस्य' (सि. कौ. २८०) is a नियमसूत्र which restricts the sense of the general rule 'संयोगान्तस्य लोपः' (सि. कौ. ५४).

(5) Fifthly, an अतिदेशसूत्र is that which indicates that the character of one thing is to be transferred to another by analogy. For instance, the rule for treating a substitute or आदेश like its former occupant or स्थानी (स्थानिवदादेशः etc., सि. कौ. ४९) is a rule for transference. This classification of सूत्रs into विधि, नियम and अतिदेश again seems to have been made under the direct influence of the methodology of the मीमांसा, which has supplied the व्याकरण with the above three terms.

(6) Lastly, an अधिकारसूत्र (a leading or governing rule) is one which stands at the beginning of a new topic and which, therefore, broadly corresponds to an अधिकरण (a topic) of other Indian systems, inasmuch as it exerts its influence over a number of सूत्रs that follow it, up to the end of a particular topic. Such अधिकारसूत्रs as 'पूर्वत्रासिद्धम्' (सि. कौ. १२), 'प्राग्रीश्वरान्निपाताः (सि. कौ. १९), 'कारके' (सि. कौ. ५३४), 'अनभिहिते' (सि. कौ. ५३६), etc., have enabled पाणिनि to avoid unnecessary repetition of words and maintain brevity of expression. In this respect he has employed two devices, viz., अनुवृत्ति and अपकर्ष, which are, of course, to be used according to certain rules. अनुवृत्ति is the process of inserting the necessary words of the अधिकारसूत्र in the following सूत्रs so as to complete their meaning; while अपकर्ष is the anticipation of a word of a later सूत्र in a former सूत्र. When the words of a former सूत्र are inserted in a later सूत्र which comes after the intervention of some other सूत्रs, the process of inserting words is called 'मण्डूकप्लुति' (Skipping or the leap of a frog).

It should not be supposed that पाणिनि's grammatical system is simply a product of his resourceful imagination, divorced from reality. For, he mainly deals with the 'भाषा' (भाष्यतेऽसौ) or *spoken* Sanskrit as distinguished from the Vedic Sanskrit, and makes repeated references to the linguistic variations of the Easterners and Northerners. He had, therefore,

the opportunity of resorting to the *direct observation* of the Sanskrit speech as used by people in its synthetic form, and of scientifically framing his सूत्रs or generalizations by the *Method of Induction* after the comparison and contrast of particular linguistic facts. His generalizations on the peculiarities of the Vedic Sanskrit are based on the mass of the Vedic literature available to him at that time, and are also reached mainly by the ' inductive method ', though it is possible to say that he was acquainted with the generalizations or rules formulated by the former grammarians. The *analytical method* of separating the stem and affix of a word and deriving it from a root is prominently observable in पाणिनि, who must have availed himself of यास्क's *etymological method*. Thus, though he concentrates his attention on the verb as the ultimate element, the Nominal Style of his सूत्रs, which can be characterized as the omission of verbs and the significant use of case-relations is in marked contrast with what he teaches.

In पाणिनि's system कात्यायन is the next important grammarian, who in his वार्तिकs has added to what पाणिनि had laid down, and has made up his deficiencies, according to the definition of the term ' वार्तिक '*. After him पतञ्जलि is the third original grammarian, who substantially contributed to the system of पाणिनि by explaining, enlarging upon, and defending the सूत्रs of the अष्टाध्यायी against कात्यायन

* उक्तानुक्तदुरुक्तचिन्ता वार्तिकम् ।

in his महाभाष्य. It can be definitely said that the systems of न्याय, वैशेषिक and मीमांसा had already been established when पतञ्जलि wrote his भाष्य and that he lent a scientific character to the grammatical system by adopting the methodology of those three systems.

In the first place, in order to settle and classify the fundamental concepts of grammar पतञ्जलि seems to have accepted almost all the categories of the वैशेषिकs with the addition of शक्ति (power, efficiency) which lies latent in the eternal relation between a word and its meaning.† At the beginning of his भाष्य, while discussing what a word means, he actually mentions the categories, viz., द्रव्य (Substance), गुण (Quality), क्रिया (Action), and सामान्य (Generality), and while telling how words should be taught, he mentions सामान्य (Generality) and विशेष (Particularity)$, though they do not strictly convey the sense of the वैशेषिकs. समवाय (Inherence) seems to have been tacitly acknowledged in the intimate relation between वाचक (word) and वाच्य (meaning), जाति (Genus) and व्यक्ति (Individual), गुण or विशेषण (quality) and गुणिन् or विशेष्य (the qualified), अवयव (part) and अवयविन् (the whole), etc. The other grammatical concepts common to the other systems are सामानाधिकरण्य (the state of having a common substratum) and कार्यकारणसम्बन्ध (causal relation). सामा-

† सिद्धे शब्दार्थसम्बन्धे । पा. म. भाष्य, आ. १.

$ किञ्चित्सामान्यविशेषवल्लक्षणं प्रवर्त्यम् । पा. म. भाष्य, आ. १.

नाधिकरण्य is denoted by words in the same case (विभक्ति) and by the instances of the कर्मधारय compound. द्रव्य, गुण and क्रिया are denoted by nouns, adjectives, and verbs respectively, yet in deciding what a word is, पतञ्जलि says that a word is not merely Substance, or Quality, or Action, or Configuration-Genus (आकृति, जाति). A word like 'गौः', however, is that which, when uttered, gives us the idea of an individual with all these attributes; or a word is the *sound* which *suggests* the idea of a thing in our daily affairs.* This definition of the word implies, of course, the theory of the indivisible स्फोट (word-essence), which is postulated by the grammarians, and which is said to be manifested by the sound or word. The question whether the meaning of a word is the genus (जाति, आकृति) or an individual (व्यक्ति, द्रव्य) has been solved by पतंञ्जलि by saying, on the authority of पाणिनि, that it is both the genus and the individual.$ It is for this reason that words are held by the grammarians to denote जाति, गुण, क्रिया and द्रव्य (व्यक्ति or संज्ञा). Like the मीमांसकs the grammarians too postulate an additional category 'शक्ति' (energy or efficiency), the manifestations of which are held by them to be Space

---

* येनोच्चारितेन सास्नालाङ्गूलककुदखुरविषाणिनां सम्प्रत्ययो भवति स शब्दः। अथवा प्रतीतपदार्थको लोके ध्वनिः शब्द इत्युच्यते। पा. म. भाष्य, आ. १.

$ किं पुनराकृतिः पदार्थ आहोस्विद् द्रव्यम्? उभयमित्याह। कथं ज्ञायते? उभयथा ह्याचार्येण सूत्राणि पठितानि। पा. म. भाष्य, आ. १.

(दिक्, देश), Time (काल), Action (क्रिया) and Instrument (साधन). The relation of space, for instance, is denoted by the ablative and locative cases, that of time by different tenses, and that of instrument (साधन) by the instrumental case. The concept of 'relation' (सम्बन्ध), which is of many kinds as indicated above, is of much importance in the grammatical science and is generally denoted by the genitive case. Action (क्रिया), which is denoted by verbal roots, is also a very important grammatical concept, and it gives rise to the कारक–relations of the agent (कर्ता), the object (कर्म), the instrument (साधन, करण), etc., in a sentence. The idea of ' करण ', which is the instrumental cause according to the grammarians, is in close conformity with the definition of 'करण' given by the नैयायिकs, as 'a peculiar and operative cause' (व्यापारवदसाधारणं कारणम्). The 'करण' or instrumental cause is distinguished by the वैयाकरणs from 'हेतु', which is according to them a cause in general or the material cause. Thus the theory of causation, which is a distinct feature of the न्याय methodology, finds its due place even in the grammatical system.

It is now an established fact that even in the time of पतञ्जलि Sanskrit was a spoken language among the cultured classes (शिष्ट). He could, therefore, expound and verify the generalizations or सूत्रs of पाणिनि and वार्तिकs of कात्यायन in the light of *repeated observation of actual linguistic facts;* in other words, he could apply *both the inductive and*

deductive methods of Logic to his exposition of the grammatical science. In this respect it is interesting to see how he describes his own method of approach to grammar. In the beginning of his भाष्य he quotes the example 'पञ्च पञ्चनखा भक्ष्याः', often used by the मीमांसक in order to explain the rule of exclusion (परिसङ्ख्या),* and comes to the conclusion that it is better for the sake of conciseness to deal with correct words to the exclusion of incorrect ones. He further says that it is not necessary also to undergo the lengthy process of quoting every correct word in language for its grammatical treatment. For, it is possible to teach a vast multitude of words, with the economy of time and labour, by means of *general* and *special* rules, which may be termed 'उत्सर्ग' and 'अपवाद' respectively. First a generalization or उत्सर्ग, which is widely applicable to many particular cases may be stated, and then the special rule or exception (अपवाद) to that generalization may be mentioned.$ Again he quotes a वाचनिकी परिभाषा § and says that if a doubt arises as to the exact meaning of a grammatical generalization, it should be dispelled by the

---

* भक्ष्यनियमेनाभक्ष्यप्रतिषेधो गम्यते । 'पञ्च पञ्चनखा भक्ष्याः' इत्युक्ते गम्यत एतद्–अतोऽन्येऽभक्ष्या इति । पा. न. भाष्य, आ. १

$ किं पुनरत्र न्यायः ? लघुत्वाच्छब्दोपदेशः । ...किञ्चित्सामान्यविशेषवल्लक्षणं प्रवर्त्यम् । येनाल्पेन यत्नेन महतो महतः शब्दौघान्प्रतिपद्येरन् । ...कश्चिदुत्सर्गः कर्तव्यः, कश्चिदपवादः । सामान्येनोत्सर्गः कर्तव्यः । तस्य विशेषेणापवादः । (पा. म. भा. आ. १). § व्याख्यानतो विशेषप्रतिपत्तिर्न हि सन्देहादलक्षणम् । (परि. भा. शेखर, १).

authoritative interpretation of that generalization supplied by the grammarians, and that the grammatical science should not be supposed to be meaningless on account of that doubt. Though the eternal relation between a word and its meaning is understood from the actual use of language made by people, and though people use words in language without forming them and without consulting a grammarian for the knowledge of their correct use, yet grammar sets down rules or generalizations for their correct use, which conduces to the religious merit. † पतञ्जलि further tells what is meant by 'Interpretation or Explanation' and adds that Explanation does not merely mean the separation of words in a सूत्र as 'वृद्धिः-आत्-ऐच्', but it includes collectively the citation of examples and counter-examples, and addition of words required for completing the meaning. All this has to be done in the case of a beginner. * This scientific method of explaining the सूत्रs or of starting from a generalization to an example is followed by पतञ्जलि everywhere in his भाष्य. In addition to this it is instructive to quote in this context a concrete

---

† लोकेऽर्थमर्थमुपादाय शब्दान्प्रयुञ्जते, नैषां निर्वृत्तौ यत्नं कुर्वन्ति।...न तद्वच्छब्दान्प्रयुयुक्षमाणो वैयाकरणकुलं गत्वाह कुरु शब्दान् प्रयोक्ष्य इति।... लोकतोऽर्थप्रयुक्ते शब्दप्रयोगे शास्त्रेण धर्मनियमः क्रियते। (पा. म. भा. आ. १)

* न केवलानि चर्चापदानि व्याख्यानम्-'वृद्धिः आत् ऐच्' इति। किं तर्हि ? उदाहरणं प्रत्युदाहरणं वाक्याध्याहार इत्येतत्समुदितं व्याख्यानं भवति। अविजानत एतदेवं भवति। पा. म. भा. आ. १.

illustration of his *etymological and dialectic method of explaining* a Vedic verse. It is as follows—

"सक्तुमिव तितउना पुनन्तो यत्र धीरा मनसा वाचमक्रत।
अत्रा सखायः सख्यानि जानते भद्रैषां लक्ष्मीर्निहिताधि वाचि ॥

सक्तुः—सचतेर्दुर्धावो भवति, कसतेर्वा विपरीताद्विकसितो भवति। तितउ परिपवनं भवति—ततवद्वा तुन्नवद्वा। धीरा ध्यानवन्तः। मनसा प्रज्ञानेन। वाचमक्रत वाचमकृषत। अत्रा सखायः सख्यानि जानते। अत्र सखायः सन्तः सख्यानि जानते। सायुज्यानि जानते। क? य एष दुर्गो मार्गः, एकगम्यो वाग्विषयः। के पुनस्ते? वैयाकरणाः। कुत एतत्? 'भद्रैषां लक्ष्मीर्निहिताधि वाचि'। एषां वाचि भद्रा लक्ष्मीर्निहिता भवति। लक्ष्मीर्लक्षणाद्भासनात्परिवृढा भवति॥" —पा. म. भा. आ. १

Particularly, this Dialectic Method of explanation has been followed by पतञ्जलि throughout the whole of his महाभाष्य, and it has assumed, in the later commentary literature, *the definite form of* 'खण्डान्वय', which will be dealt with in detail later on.

It will be clear from what has been said above that पतञ्जलि is in favour of the *deductive method of teaching grammar,* inasmuch as he finds that the process of starting from a generlization to an example is the most economical way of dealing with that subject. Yet he recognizes the truth that people learn language by actual usage, and that grammar simply helps them to correct and organize their speech. Of course, he is quite conscious of the fact that the generalizations or rules of grammar are based on the language already in use, and that those generalizations are arrived at *inductively* by grammarians from the particular examples

of the language used. He again acknowledges the importance of *concrete examples* (उदाहरण, प्रत्युदा-हरण), which clarify the meanings of abstract rules particularly in the case of beginners (अविजानतः). It may, therefore, be said that in the teaching of grammar the *inductive method* of starting from examples to the rule, though not economical, is not quite contrary to his purport. It must be admitted that the inductive method is limited in its scope, since according to it we cannot exhaust all the examples in language illustrating a particular grammatical rule, and that it is not strictly scientific to arrive at a generalization from a few examples. But it must be remembered that even in the deductive process of starting from a generalization to examples it is not possible to quote all examples. Thus in respect of the strictly scientific teaching of grammar to young pupils both the inductive method and the deductive method are on a par with each other. If we take into account the undeveloped understanding of young pupils according to modern psychology, and if we also remember the fact that the grammarians like पाणिनि and पतञ्जलि themselves *derived* grammatical generalizations from the repeated observation of concrete linguistic facts, there is no harm in reversing the order of the traditional process of teaching grammar (from rules to examples) only at the beginner's stage.

The scientific way, in which the grammarians themselves proceed *inductively* through the re-

peated observation of concrete examples to the generalization, and analyse words into प्रकृति and प्रत्यय, is again described by पतञ्जलि as follows. He says that the distinct meanings of प्रकृति and प्रत्यय can be known by the *Logical Method of Agreement and Difference* (अन्वयव्यतिरेक).†

For instance, when the word 'वृक्षः' is uttered, the sound of the stem (प्रकृति) 'वृक्ष' and the affix (प्रत्यय) 'स्' is heard. In association with this the meaning 'an object with fruit, roots, leaves and branches' is known from the प्रकृति 'वृक्ष', and the meaning 'oneness' (एकत्व) is known from the प्रत्यय 'स्'. Again, when the word 'वृक्षौ' is uttered, the sound 'स्' disappears (हीयते), the sound 'औ' is added and heard (उपजायते), and the sound 'वृक्ष' ending in 'अ' remains common (अन्वयी). Along with this the meaning 'oneness' is dropped, the meaning 'twoness' is added, and the meaning 'an object with fruit, roots, leaves and branches' remains common. Hence it can be determined that the meaning of a sound (e. g. स्) is that which disappears with the disappearance of that sound, that the meaning of a sound (e. g. औ) is that which is added with the addition of that sound, and that the meaning of a sound which is common (e. g. वृक्ष) is that which ramains the same with that sound.

Again, if the word 'पचति' (He cooks) is uttered,

† See the भाष्य on 'सिद्धं त्वन्वयव्यतिरेकाभ्याम्' ॥१॥
पा. म. भा., १-२-४५ and १-३-१.

the sounds 'पच्' and 'अति' are heard; and the meanings invariably associated with them are understood by us. In other words, 'the action of cooking' is associated with the stem 'पच्' and 'the agency and oneness' (कर्तृत्वमेकत्वं च) are associated with the affix 'अति'. If again the word 'पठति' (He reads) is uttered, the sound 'पच्' vanishes (हीयते), the sound 'पठ्' is added (उपजायते), and the sound 'अति' remains common (अन्वयी). In association with this, the meaning 'action of cooking' of the stem 'पच्' vanishes, the meaning 'action of reading' of the stem 'पठ्' is added, and the meaning 'agency and oneness' of the affix 'अति' remains common. It can, therefore, be decided that the meaning of a particular word (e. g. पच्) is that which disappears with the disappearance of its sound, that the meaning of a word (e. g. पठ्) is that which is added with the addition of its sound, and that the meaning of that which is common (e. g. अति) is that, the sound of which is common.

Thus the *repeated observation of the presence and absence of a sound* in its invariable association with the *presence and absence of an idea* (action, individual or thing) leads us to analyse a word into प्रकृति and प्रत्यय, to find out their *agreement and difference* (अन्वयव्यतिरेक), and to determine their respective meanings. The same *analytical process* (पदसंस्कार) of the observation of agreement and difference can be adopted in the case of all the

possible forms of a collection of similar words. For instance, all the case-forms (बालः, बालम्, बालेन, बालाय, बालात्, etc.) of the same प्रातिपदिक (e. g. बाल) or all the verbal forms (e. g. पठति, पठतः, पठन्ति etc.) of the same root (e. g. पठ्) in a particular tense or mood can be collected, so as to distinguish their similar elements (प्रकृति) like 'बाल' and 'पठ्' from dissimilar elements like the प्रत्ययs. Really speaking, the meaning of a word can be better understood when both the प्रकृति and प्रत्यय are combined in their synthetic or natural form in language; yet the *analytical method* of grammar helps us to enter into the heart of the individual meaning of a word, and to use it correctly.

Of course, this analytical method of agreement and difference is so far followed with the assumption that each sound or word represents only one idea. But how can this method be applied to synonyms like 'इन्द्रः, शक्रः, पुरुहूतः, पुरन्दरः' etc., and to homonyms like 'अक्षाः, पादाः, माषाः' etc.? पतञ्जलि answers that here too the meanings are determined by the same method. For, it is found by the repeated observation of the presence and absence of sounds or words that the synonyms of a particular word as well as the different meanings denoted by a homonym are limited in number, and that a limited number of sounds is invariably associated with a limited number of meanings. It is, therefore, possible to apply the method of 'अन्वयव्यतिरेक' in such cases, and also to determine the distinct meanings of प्रकृति and प्रत्यय.

This *scientific method* of the repeated observation of अन्वय and व्यतिरेक in the grammatical forms of words as described in detail by पतञ्जलि is the *inductive method*. This is the *grammarian's own approach* to particular linguistic facts so as to arrive at the grammatical generalizations or rules. The same concrete process should be adopted in teaching grammar to young pupils. In other words, the pupils are to be placed first in the position of investigators into the similarity or difference of the particular forms of words, and then led through their repeated observation to arrive at a generalization as the last step. This method is, of course, to be adopted up to a certain stage of the understanding of pupils, when the concrete approach to grammar is calculated to prove more beneficial to them. Moreover, it should be noted that the field of the observation of linguistic facts in the case of pupils is far more limited than that in the case of a grammarian who has to traverse a vast area. The inductive method can, therefore, be followed in the case of pupils in a far more economical way, though this procedure would not be thoroughly scientific, as the generalization would be reached after the observation of a few linguistic facts. Another linguistic principle to be noted in the भाष्य of पतञ्जलि is that there is the *intimate relation or invariable association between a sound (word) and its meaning*. This psychological fact observed by him shows how a *direct bond* between a word and an idea is formed in our minds; and it gives a

hint of the Direct Method of teaching sounds or words in association with concrete objects. In short, पतञ्जलि has presented a scientific aspect to the analysis of words (पदसंस्कार) in grammar, by adopting the principles of general methodology propounded by Logic.

After पतञ्जलि's महाभाष्य the two important grammatical works worthy of being taken into account are the वाक्यपदीय of भर्तृहरि and the काशिकावृत्ति of the joint authors जयादित्य and वामन who were Buddhists. The वाक्यपदीय principally deals with the philosophical aspect of grammar and expounds in detail the theory of स्फोट (word-essence). The grammarians, who are स्फोटवादिन्s and hence वाक्यवादिन्s, say that the स्फोट is an indivisible whole containing all meanings, that it is manifested by the sounds of words, and that the 'वाक्यस्फोट' is the principal one. They, therefore, add that a sentence is the unit of language, and that the analytical method of separating the प्रकृति and प्रत्यय of a word (पद) is an imaginary and artificial process adopted solely for the purpose of facilitating the understanding of beginners. *

Now the काशिकावृत्ति is, perhaps, the best commentary on the अष्टाध्यायी, and it lucidly explains every सूत्र with many examples, chiefly following the order of सूत्रs adopted by पाणिनि. It appears that the

---

* उपायाः शिक्षमाणानां बालानामुपलालनाः ।
असत्ये वर्त्मनि स्थित्वा ततः सत्यं समीहते ॥–वाक्यपदीयम्, २।२४०

study of the Paninian system was popular with the the Buddhists, of whom the authors of the काशिका and जिनेन्द्रबुद्धि $ have contributed much to the system of पाणिनि. It is interesting and instructive to know what I-tsing, the Chinese pilgrim of the 7th century (671-695 A. D.), says about the ancient grammarians in पाणिनि's system, the ancient methods of studying it and the period required for finishing the study of each work. With reference to the prominent position held by Grammar in the curriculum of the 7th century A. D., I-tsing says, "I trust that now a thorough study of Sanskrit grammar may clear up many difficulties we encounter whilst engaged in translation." He then refers to the अष्टाध्यायी of पाणिनि and further says, "Children begin to learn the सूत्र when they are *eight years old* and can repeat it in *eight months' time.*" Then incidentally mentioning 'The Book on धातु' (धातुपाठ) he tells that the pupils studied afterwards 'The Book on the Three Khilas.' It is said to contain three parts, viz., अष्टधातु, मण्ड or मुण्ड (माण्डूकी शिक्षा ?) and उणादि. The अष्टधातु is said to deal with सुबन्त and तिङन्त or the declension of nouns and conjugation of verbs;† the मण्ड or मुण्ड (?) treated of "the formation of words by means of combining a root

$ He is also called 'श्रीबोधिसत्त्वदेशीयाचार्य', and is the author of the न्यास, a detailed commentary on the काशिका.

† Was this अष्टधातु like our 'शब्दरूपावलि' and 'धातुरूपावलि' containing ready-made forms of words?

and a suffix or suffixes"; and the उणादि contained "a class of primary suffixes beginning with उ." After this he says," Boys begin to learn the book on the three Khilas (or 'three pieces of waste land") when they are *ten years old,* and understand them thoroughly after *three years'* diligent study." Regarding the exact nature of the three खिलs nothing more than this can be said, since except the उणादि they do not seem to exist to-day. The work studied afterwards by ancient pupils is the काशिका which is styled 'The Vritti-sutra' by him and about which he says, " Boys of *fifteen* begin to study this commentary, and understand it after *five years.* If men of China go to India for study, they have first of all to learn this (grammatical) work, then other subjects; if not, their labour will be thrown away. All these books should be learnt by heart. But this, as a rule, applies only to men of high talent, while for those of medium or little ability a different measure (method) must be taken according to their wishes. They should study hard day and night, without letting a moment pass for idle repose...... After having studied this commentary, students begin to learn composition in prose and verse, and devote themselves to logic (हेतुविद्या) and metaphysic (अभिधर्मकोश). *In learning the* न्यायद्वारतारकशास्त्र they rightly draw inferences (अनुमान); and by studying the जातकमाला* their powers of

* Here he refers to the Sanskrit text of आर्यशूर's जातकमाला which is written in a beautiful Sanskrit style.

comprehension increase. Thus instructed by their teachers and instructing others they pass *two or three years*, generally in the Nalanda monastery." †
I-tsing then alludes to पतञ्जलि's महाभाष्य, which is called 'चूर्णि' by him, and which was studied at the last stage of the grammatical course. About it he remarks, "Advanced scholars learn this in *three years.*" He then gives detailed information about the personality and works of भर्तृहरि.

The conclusions to be deduced from the above extracts are that in order to attain a thorough mastery of Sanskrit the study of grammar was considered to be the most important means; and if the whole period mentioned for finishing the full course in it up to the study of पतञ्जलि's महाभाष्य be taken into consideration, it comprises about twelve years, testifying to the adage 'द्वादशभिर्वर्षैर्व्याकरणं श्रूयते' (पञ्चतन्त्र). Another note-worthy fact is that even though the grammar of पाणिनि has been held to be a वेदाङ्ग, it was found to be an indispensable subject of study by the non-Vedic Buddhists also; and this fact proves the non-sectarian character of its major portion which is devoted to the Classical Sanskrit. The third thing to be noted is that the study of grammar was first begun and continued at least for nine years up to the complete study of the काशिका, after which the attention of students was drawn to the reading of literature like the

† A Record of the Buddhist Religion, by I-tsing, translated by J. Takakusu.

जातकमाला, to composition in prose and verse, and to the study of other शास्त्रs like logic and metaphysics. It is not definitely known what sort of literature (prose and poetry) other than the जातकमाला was read by students. It is highly probable that the बुद्धचरित of अश्वघोष and some other literary works were read along with the जातकमाला. Yet the study of grammar for nine continuous years without anything of literature was, doubtless, unduly long and tedious. It may be said here that Sanskrit was perhaps used in speech and writing by cultured people at that time, that it was a far more living language to the people of that period than it is at present, and that being in closer touch with it the anicent students could perseveringly pursue their grammatical studies in the light of concrete examples of the living language. Granting all these suppositions it ought to be said that the incessant pursuit of grammar for so long a period might certainly have been irksome to students. To add to this tedium everything had to be learnt by heart. Although learning by heart has its own merits which I-tsing has acknowledged elsewhere, * it may be suggested in agreement with him that there is some room for improvement in such a method, and that distinction between intelligent and ordinary students should be observed in this respect. I-tsing, perhaps, means that learning by heart should be limited

* I-tsing's passage about the importance of memorization has been quoted by us in the chapter on 'Syllabus in Sanskrit,' (Section II).

only to important things like the पाणिनीयसूत्रs, and that the period of studying grammar should be shortened so as to allow more time for the reading of literature.

It must be remembered that the काशिकावृत्ति is written strictly in the order in which पाणिनि has written his अष्टाध्यायी, which is wanting in a proper topical arrangement. The result of this was that unless the whole of the काशिका was studied for five years, it was not possible for ancient students to know the grammatical formation of words. Had the अष्टाध्यायी been taught according to some topical arrangement, its study might have been simplified and prosecuted in a less number of years. It was necessary to adopt that arrangement of grammatical topics which would correspond to the change in the genius of Sanskrit from the Verbal to the Nominal Style. It is, therefore, advisable to mark the stages of growth which Sanskrit language has gradually undergone, and the chief characteristics which it has assumed once for all.

Since the Vedic times Sanskrit has been the language of the religion, science and culture of the Hindus. It is now our language of sacraments; and it has been definitely proved by scholars that it was used in speech and writing by the cultured classes up to the beginning of the Mohammedan period. In the fourth and fifth centuries A. D., it was the court language of the गुप्तs; as is evidenced by the Sanskrit inscriptions of that period, and even the Buddhists and the Jains, despite the commands of

the founders of their religions to use only प्राकृतs, adopted the suitable medium of Sanskrit in later times for the propagation of their faiths, and substantially contributed to Sanskrit grammar and literature. *Yuan Chwang* (629-645 A. D.), the Chinese pilgrim, tells that Sanskrit was used by the Hindus and the Buddhists of the 7th century A. D., in debates, public and private. He says, " In language, speaking generally, they have not varied from the original source, but the people of ' Mid-India ' are pre-eminently explicit and correct in speech, their expressions being harmonious and elegant, like those of the *devas*, and their intonation clear and distinct, serving as a rule and pattern for others."$ He also mentions the fact that the language was undergoing deterioration along the border lands of India; yet it can clearly be seen that Sanskrit was being spoken, more correctly of course by cultured people, in his time. Side by side with this the ceaseless literary activity of the most distinguished and learned poets and philosophers continued in producing the best literature in Sanskrit at least up to the end of the 12th century A. D.

Now the gradual and continuous transition of Sanskrit *from the Verbal to the Nominal Style* may be described. The most ancient Vedic Sanskrit assumed a new form in the ब्राह्मणs and उपनिषद्s which chiefly represented the Verbal Style. In the Brahmanic Sanskrit the antiquated forms of

$ Yuan Chwang's Travels in India, by Thomas Watters.

Vedic words are eliminated; the declension of nouns being regularized approaches that of the Classical Sanskrit; verbal roots are classified according to conjugations, though the distinction between the परस्मैपद and आत्मनेपद is not strictly observed; and the indeclinable participles ending in 'त्वा' and 'तुम्' are being regularly used. In it verbal forms (finite verbs) in all tenses and moods are abundantly found, and the correct use of the past tenses, viz., the Perfect and the Aorist, is made. The sentences are short, simple and not involved or complex. If the relative clauses are used, they are easy and very few. The language of the उपनिषद्s shows almost the same traits, yet it contains less archaic forms than the ब्राह्मणs and comes nearer to the Classical Sanskrit.

The सूत्र–works which followed the उपनिषद्s show a marked change from the Verbal to the Nominal Style, a few features of which have been indicated in the context of सूत्र–works. पाणिनि's सूत्रs are, of course, not an exception to the general tendency of the सूत्र–works, and strangely enough, adopt the Nominal Style simply for the sake of brevity, though they deal with verbs at a great length. Although पाणिनि treats of the Sanskrit language of the literature that preceded him, yet he mainly treats of the spoken form (भाषा) of Sanskrit in his time. Thus the norm laid down by पाणिनि in his grammar brought, as it were, into being the Classical Sanskrit and exerted a permanent influence upon the later Classical

Literature, which was, on the whole, prominently Nominal in style. This style can be traced back at least to 300 B. C., when कौटिल्य wrote his अर्थशास्त्र. *The main features of that Nominal Style* are as follows—

(1) In the Nominal Style more stress is laid on the case-relations of nouns and noun-equivalents (adjectives, nominal derivatives and verbal derivatives) as expressive of various senses like कर्ता, कर्म, करण, etc., than on the finite verb, which occupies an insignificant position in a Sanskrit sentence. Many times the genitive, as a general case (शेषे षष्ठी), expresses the senses of other cases. The genitive and locative absolutes, which express special relations of a subordinate clause with the principal clause, are peculiar to Sanskrit.

(2) Compounds are employed in a more or less degree in the Classical Literature giving rise to the four styles of Sanskrit composition, viz., वैदर्भी, गौडी, पाञ्चाली and लाटी. Compounds are doubtless useful for securing brevity of expression; yet some later writers use lengthy compounds so profusely that they make their language perplexing, cumbrous and artificial. The बहुव्रीहि compound, which compresses a whole sentence into an adjectival phrase and which adds grace to the language, is a speciality of the Nominal Style. The अव्ययीभाव compound is another speciality which brings together more words than one into an adverbial phrase.

(3) The verbal forms of the root भू and अस् (to be) are many times idiomatically dropped, and the

function of these two is performed by nouns and adjectives, which are their compliments, and which are, therefore, used predicatively. Sometimes a verb like 'पचति' is split into two parts, one signifying the special action by means of a noun or adjective like 'पाक' or 'पक्व', and another denoting the general action by means of verbs like 'करोति' or 'भवति'. This tendency is generally found among the मीमांसकs, who split verbs like 'यजेत' into 'यागेन भावयेत्–कुर्यात्'. Sometimes the verb is altogether dropped by using nominal expressions like 'वेदपाठकः' for 'वेदं पाठयति'. Thus nominal derivatives and participles are many times employed for finite verbs. Again the passive form of a verb or a participle is of more occurrence than the active one. All these devices are used perhaps for simplifying 'Expression' through the non-observance of distinctions in the conjugational system, and have caused many roots in the धातुपाठ to fall into disuse. The tendency of avoiding difficult verbal forms by means of the above devices is found in the पञ्चतन्त्र and the हितोपदेश, which are specially meant for beginners in Sanskrit. The verbs in the present tense are generally used in the speeches of characters in dramas and stories, in the statements of general truths and in the descriptive and reflective compositions; yet the passive forms of the present tense are mostly preferred to the active ones. The finite verb in the present tense is many times eliminated by using the present participle adjectively or predicatively,

in order to join clauses and maintain the balance and continuity of a sentence. The historic and habitual present tenses are found generally in the पञ्चतन्त्र and similar works. The future tense is less frequent than the present; and the Second Future is more common than the First Future. The adjectival use of future participles is also made for joining clauses and maintaining balance in a sentence. The past tense is mostly employed in narration, and the use of the Imperfect, Perfect and Aorist with their special functions is made more or less correctly by authors. Some authors do not seem to observe any distinction among those three tenses; while some without employing the actual forms of the past tense indicate it simply by using 'स्म' with verbs in the present tense. The more common way of denoting the past tense is that of using the past passive participles and past active participles, which do the work of noun-equivalents, of qualitative and predicative adjectives, or of finite verbs themselves. The past passive participles of transitive as well as intransitive verbs are, however, more frequent than the past active participles, and hence the authors usually adopt passive and impersonal constructions in their writings. Similarly, potential passive participles are frequently used for verbs in the potential mood, and the sentence in which they are employed naturally becomes passive in construction. This general partiality for past participles shows the indifference of the authors to the specific functions of the above three kinds of the past tense.

(4) *Syntax*—Passive and impersonal constructions, as referred to above, are frequent in sentences. Later authors exhibit much fondness for periphrasis, alliterations, lengthy compounds, *double-entendre*, and complicated or unwieldy sentences. An affirmative sentence is sometimes turned into that with a double negative. The Sanskrit sentence affords much scope for flexibility of expression on account of freedom in the order of words given by the inflexional nature of the language. The order of words, however, is not wholly arbitrary, since in sentences language-units (words, etc.) are used according to the natural sequence of thought. In a prose sentece, therefore, the subject with its attributive adjuncts comes first, then the object, if any, with its attributive adjuncts, and the verb or predicate with its adverbial adjuncts comes last. But adverbs and adverbial expressions never come at the end of a sentence. The words which are governed precede those by which they are governed; and hence a qualitative adjective precedes its substantive; but predicative adjectives come after the subject. Words in the genitive and those in apposition generally precede a noun to which they are related. Vocatives, interrogatives and exclamatory words come at the beginning of a sentence. The predicate generally follows the subject, yet this order is sometimes reversed for the sake of emphasis. Conjunctions are generally used at the beginning of clauses, yet those like च, वा, तु, हि, चेत्, etc., never occur at the begin-

ning. Relative words like यथा, यावत्, यद्, यतः, etc., are used at the beginning of subordinate clauses and their correlatives like तथा, तावत्, तद्, ततः, etc., stand before the principal clause. But as in English, the subordinate clauses sometimes follow the principal clause, the order of relative and correlative words being correspondingly reversed. Sometimes the relative words stand between two clauses in such a way that their correlatives are naturally dropped. Absolute constructions mostly precede the principal clause, and absolutives or infinitives coming at the end of subordinate clauses precede the finite verb in the principal clause. The same holds good in the case of gerunds in 'अम्' (णमुल्) which sometimes compress a clause into a small phrase. Later writers employ unduly long sentences which generally contain a single subject, a single object if any, and a single finite verb; but a single noun in them is related to a succession of lengthy expressions in apposition, or to a series of adjectival phrases composed of long compounds, or to a row of relative clauses, short words being interspersed here and there in them to mark pauses. Thus it is found that the major portion of a sentence in the Classical Sanskrit mostly consists of nominal forms (nouns, adjectives, participles, तद्धितs, etc.), and a single finite verb in it is postponed to its end.

(5) The style common to all the शास्त्रs in the later period is nominal in the extreme, since sentences in it represent, in addition to the above-

advanced classes, and that the masses, who were keenly interested in Sanskrit literature, had no means of studying Sanskrit grammar easily and speedily. In order to meet this popular demand he composed the कातन्त्रसूत्रs, which treated of as much grammar as was required for the understanding of the classical literature, though they did not exhaust the whole grammatical science or produce erudite grammarians. With a popular aim he purposely dropped in the कातन्त्र the प्रत्याहारसूत्रs, the प्रत्याहारs formed therefrom, the artificial संज्ञाs like अच्, हल्, etc., the whole of the वैदिकी प्रक्रिया, and all obscure or unnecessary details. Hence the first grammarian, making, with a clear insight, grammar subservient to the classical Sanskrit literature *strictly in accordance with its Nominal Style*, is शर्ववर्मन्, who made a decisive improvement on पाणिनि's grammar by systematically arranging the grammatical topics in the following order—

१ संज्ञा, २ सन्धि, ३ सुबन्त, ४ अव्यय, ५ कारक, ६ स्त्रीप्रत्यय, ७ समास, ८ तद्धित, ९ आख्यात, १० कृदन्त, and ११ उणादि.

Though the details of this order have been dropped here, the broad outline, as given above, will clearly indicate how he first deals with the nominal part of the language and lastly with the verbal part, and how later grammarians have been more or less influenced by the कातन्त्र in respect of the arrangement of grammatical topics. Dr. Belvalkar has proved that the chapters in the कातन्त्र on the निपात, स्त्रीप्रत्यय, तद्धित, कृदन्त and उणादि were not originally

written by शर्ववर्मन्, and that they were later on interpolated in it for making up its deficiencies. This is highly probable because those portions are not quite necessary in a popular grammar, although it must be admitted that the knowledge of a few important स्त्रीप्रत्ययs, तद्धितs and कृदन्तs is very essential to the study of the classical Sanskrit literature. Dr. Belvalkar significantly says, " If शर्ववर्मन् did not think it necessary to teach the कृत् section to his Royal pupil (सातवाहन), no more did he care to teach him the तद्धित section (or the स्त्रीप्रत्यय section) ".* If we again take into consideration the last sentence in the previously quoted passage of Dr. Bhandarkar, we understand, why शर्ववर्मन् might not have written his chapter on the तद्धित portion.

If there is a grain of truth in the divine origin of the कातन्त्र from कुमारकार्तिकेय, the son of शिव, it is that शर्ववर्मन् wrote the कातन्त्रसूत्रs after the close study of पाणिनि's system, the origin of which was ascribed to शिव. For instance, the कातन्त्रसूत्रs 'संयोगान्तस्य लोपः' (का. २–३–५४), 'गत्यर्थकर्मणि द्वितीयाचतुर्थ्यौ चेष्टायामनध्वनि' (का. २–४–२४), 'मन्यकर्मणि चानादरेऽप्राणिनि' (का. २–४–२५), 'तुमर्थाच्च भाववाचिनः' (का. २–४–२८), 'हो ढः' (का. ३–६–५६), 'कर्मण्यण्' (का. ४–३–१), 'अकर्तरि च कारके संज्ञायाम्' (का. ४–५–४), etc., bear close resemblance to the corresponding सूत्रs of पाणिनि. The most important contribution, however, made to grammar by शर्ववर्मन् is that of the *natural (nominal) arrangement and*

* See Dr. Belvalkar's 'Systems of Sanskrit Grammar.'

sequence of grammatical topics; and this is the reason why the कातन्त्र is even now studied in Bengal. The अग्निपुराण$ epitomizes the whole of Sanskrit grammar in eleven chapters of 239 verses (अग्निपुराण, अ. ३४९–३५९), and states that the tradition of this grammar has been handed down from स्कन्द or कुमार-कार्तिकेय. This, perhaps, means that the chapters in the अग्निपुराण are an epitome of the कातन्त्र; and hence it is natural that the order of grammatical topics in the former is almost the same as that in the latter. Those chapters are, therefore, calculated to serve the valuable purpose of settling the most essential grammatical portions to be studied by ordinary students.

It is found after careful examination and comparison that the later grammatical works like the शाकटायनव्याकरण of जैनशाकटायन (9th century A. D.), the सिद्धहेमशब्दानुशासन of हेमचन्द्र (11th century A. D.), the सारस्वत (13th century A. D.), the मुग्धबोध of बोपदेव (13th century A. D.), the रूपमाला of विमलसरस्वती (14th century A. D.), the प्रक्रियाकौमुदी of रामचन्द्र (15th century A. D.), and the सिद्धान्तकौमुदी of भट्टोजी दीक्षित (17th century A. D.) have more or less followed the same order of grammatical topics as in the कातन्त्र.† It is not

---

$ Its date according to MM. P. V. Kane is about the 8th century A. D. See his Introduction to the साहित्यदर्पण.

† See Dr. Belvalkar's '*Systems of Sanskrit Grammar.*' We have, moreover, consulted several original works of those systems and other grammatical manuals, both in the printed and manuscript form, in order to ascertain the natural order of topics and to arrive at the above conclusions.

definitely known how far they were influenced by the कातन्त्र. If it is supposed that some of them have independently discoverd the natural arrangement of topics, it means that they have consciously or unconsciously tended to the same natural order in accordance with the prominently Nominal character of Classical Sanskrit; and this fact doubtless yields a linguistic principle that *the Nominal part of Sanskrit grammar must be taught to pupils before the Verbal part.*

Almost all the above grammarians except विमलसरस्वती, रामचन्द्र, and भट्टोजी दीक्षित have dropped the परिभाषाs and the वैदिकप्रक्रिया. Of all the grammatical works prior to the सिद्धान्तकौमुदी of भट्टोजी, the कातन्त्र and the सारस्वत seem to have been the most popular, since they are non-sectarian and treat of important topics in an easy, brief and graded manner. It is likely that भट्टोजी should have availed himself of all the attempts of his predecessors in the execution of the perfect and natural arrangement of grammatical topics in his सिद्धान्तकौमुदी. Yet it is almost certain that he owes more to the रूपमाला of विमलसरस्वती and the प्रक्रियाकौमुदी of रामचन्द्र than to others in this respect, inasmuch as they are the works belonging to पाणिनि's system, and have more or less done justice to the वैदिकप्रक्रिया. The तद्धित, समास and वैदिक sections, however, are not properly placed in the रूपमाला, which gives the first two at the end and the वैदिक section in the middle. भट्टोजी has made a decided improvement on the रूपमाला in this respect. The

order of topics in the सिद्धान्तकौमुदी is broadly as follows—

I— १ संज्ञा, २ परिभाषा, ३ सन्धि, ४ सुबन्त, ५ अव्यय, ६ स्त्रीप्रत्यय, ७ कारक, ८ समास, ९ तद्धित, १० द्विरुक्त.

II— ११ तिङन्त, १२ पूर्वकृदन्त, १३ उणादि, १४ उत्तरकृदन्त, १५ वैदिकप्रक्रिया, १६ स्वरप्रकरण, १७ लिङ्गानुशासन.

The credit, therefore, of bringing all the topics connected with the nominal part in the first volume of the सिद्धान्तकौमुदी, of dealing with the verbal part in its second volume, of doing proper justice to the वैदिकप्रक्रिया at the end, and of popularizing the system of पाणिनि in a new and perfect form certainly goes to भट्टोजी. Thus in the evolution of the arrangement of grammatical topics corresponding to the growth of Sanskrit from the Verbal to the Nominal style the सिद्धान्तकौमुदी represents perhaps the last stage, and is an epoch-making work from the view-point of the re-establishment of पाणिनि's system.

After भट्टोजी had written the सिद्धान्तकौमुदी, his disciple वरदराज, who was saturated with पाणिनि's system, and who knew very well the relative importance of every सूत्र from the view-point of average students, popularized that system more than those of the कातन्त्र and the सारस्वत. He successively issued with untiring energy his three epitomes of the सिद्धान्तकौमुदी, viz., the मध्यसिद्धान्तकौमुदी, the लघुसिद्धान्तकौमुदी and the सारसिद्धान्तकौमुदी.† Out of about 4000 सूत्रs of पाणिनि the मध्यकौमुदी contains 2315 सूत्रs, the लघुकौमुदी

† This is still in a manuscript form.

1380 सूत्रs and the सारकौमुदी 700 सूत्रs. All those epitomes indicate the gradual process of reducing the most important grammatical portions to their minimum. The सारसिद्धान्तकौमुदी, which is not yet printed, will render valuable assistance to those who want to ascertain the most essential topics of grammar to be studied by average pupils. As regards the arrangement of topics the noteworthy feature of all those epitomes is that they *alternately deal with the nominal part and the verbal part* of Sanskrit. The general order of topics in them is as follows—

१ संज्ञा, २ सन्धि, ३ सुबन्त, ४ अव्यय, ५ तिङन्त, ६ कृदन्त, ७ विभक्त्यर्थ (कारक), ८ समास, ९ तद्धित, १० स्त्रीप्रत्यय.

In this arrangement वरदराज has devoted to the teaching of verb-formation (तिङन्त) 596 सूत्रs in the मध्यकौमुदी, 486 सूत्रs in the लघुकौमुदी, and 192 सूत्रs in the सारकौमुदी. He, perhaps, thought that unless the pupils would broadly understand the formation of verbs, they would not realize the propriety of the participles (कृदन्त) often used in literature. Thus he thought that the alternate teaching of the nominal part and the verbal part would be beneficial to students, and hence he changed the order of topics in the सिद्धान्तकौमुदी. It should be admitted that there is some truth in the view that nouns and noun-equivalents should be taught side by side with verbs and verbal derivatives so as to give some idea of the Sanskrit sentence. Yet under the present circumstances when Sanskrit is becoming an unpopular

subject, *it is expedient to limit the formation of verbs to the First Group of Conjugations only*. The reasons for this will be stated in a separate chapter.$

स्वामी दयानन्दसरस्वती too has recast almost the whole of the अष्टाध्यायी with the addition of 112 परिभाषाs and important sentences from the महाभाष्य of पतञ्जलि. He has put together all this matter in his वेदाङ्गप्रकाश (1882 A. D.), which follows almost the same order of grammatical topics as in the सिद्धान्तकौमुदी, and which seeks to explain the सूत्रs clearly in *Hindī*. On account of the importance he attaches to the Vedic lore he deprecates the कातन्त्र, the सारस्वत, the चन्द्रिका, the मुग्धबोध and the सिद्धान्तकौमुदी, which, he says, either do not at all deal with the वैदिकप्रक्रिया, or give a secondary place to it. When he himself follows the order of topics in the सिद्धान्तकौमुदी, it is unaccountable why he should denounce even that monumental work. He asserts that the whole of Sanskrit grammar can be mastered in *three years*, while the सिद्धान्तकौमुदी and other grammatical works like the शेखर, the मनोरमा, etc., make the subject more difficult. He, however, shows much respect for पतञ्जलि's महाभाष्य, the study of which is recommended by him. He has expressed the same views in his सत्यार्थप्रकाश (तृतीयसमुल्लास), and has demonstrated there in detail the method of teaching grammar. He says that the शिक्षा of पाणिनि should be first taught to pupils with special instructions in pronunciation. Then the

$ See 'Syllabus in Sanskrit', Section II.

pupils may be made to learn by heart the अष्टाध्यायी, and afterwards all the सूत्रs may be clearly explained. Here † he gives in detail the same method of explaining the सूत्रs as he has followed in the वेदाङ्गप्रकाश. He further says that after a clear and detailed explanation of the अष्टाध्यायी is given, it should again be revised, and then the महाभाष्य should be taught. Again, he asserts that if both the teacher and the taught are intelligent, hardworking and persevering, the अष्टाध्यायी can be finished in one year and a half, and further the महाभाष्य within the same period. Thus according to him a student can attain proficiency in grammar in *three years*, and can properly and profitably devote the remaining time to the study of other शास्त्रs. He prefers the 'आर्ष' method (used by the great sages like पाणिनि and पतञ्जलि) of teaching grammar to that followed by the कातन्त्र, the सिद्धान्तकौमुदी, etc., as the former, he says, is economical from the standpoint of time and labour, and as the latter is made purposely difficult and artificial (!). It is, however, strange that though he underrates the सिद्धान्तकौमुदी, he generally follows its arrangement of grammatical topics in his वेदाङ्गप्रकाश ! दयानन्दसरस्वती was, doubtless, a great Sanskrit scholar who tried his utmost for the revival of Sanskrit learning. His thoughts on the teaching of Sanskrit are, therefore, worthy of consideration and trial.

---

† See the 'सत्यार्थप्रकाश' , तृतीयसमुल्लास.

A new attempt of organizing the सूत्र of पाणिनि, in such a way that the organization would serve as a good introduction to the सिद्धान्तकौमुदी, has been made by Pt. गङ्गासहाय of Bundi, whose सुगमकौमुदी has been published by the Venkateshwar Press in 1902 A. D. He finds that even the लघुकौमुदी contains some matter not required by beginners, and that some information usually required by them is not included in it. He, therefore, has divided the सूत्रs of पाणिनि into two chapters of two sections each, and has arranged them according to the *Concentric Method.* By the 'concentric method' a subject *as a whole* is first taught *in a broad outline,* and then more and more details of the same are gradually introduced, so as to suit the capacities of beginners. The concentric method is thoroughly scientific or psychological according to the modern technique of teaching, and is calculated to be much beneficial particularly to novices, if it is followed in the teaching of पाणिनि's grammar. The author of the सुगमकौमुदी, for instance, has given in the first section of about 745 सूत्रs the broad outline of the whole of Sanskrit grammar, has introduced in it all the most important portions required by an ordinary student for reading literature, and has followed the same order of topics as adopted in the epitomes of वरदराज. He has further introduced more and more details of the same topics in the same order in the remaining three sections of the book. This method as adopted by the author is worthy

of being actually practised and merits wider circulation.

Side by side with the tendency of epitomizing पाणिनि's अष्टाध्यायी another tendency of teaching *the ready-made forms of nouns and verbs* is visible in the introduction of grammar. The latter tendency seems to have long preceded the former, if the 'अट्ठधातु' of the Buddhists, as previously referred to, might have been similar to our शब्दरूपावलि and धातुरूपावलि. It should be remembered that the need of books like the शब्दरूपावलि and the धातुरूपावलि is not felt when a language is current or spoken, but it is felt when the language ceases to be spoken. The 'वाररुचसङ्ग्रह', which is ascribed to वररुचि, but which is really written by an unknown author, has been commented upon by some नारायण of 1426 A. D.† It may, therefore, be concluded that the manual was written at least before the 14th century A. D. This small manual of 25 verses gives the most essential information about कारक, समास, तद्धित, तिङ्, कृत्, मिश्रवाचक and कर्तृप्रत्यय without at all dealing with the formation of nouns and verbs. The book, therefore, seems to presuppose the knowledge of their *ready-made forms* on the part of the pupils through the शब्दरूपावलि and the धातुरूपावलि, and then treats particularly of *syntax* and the different ready-made members of a sentence. If this presumption is correct, it may be concluded that the practice of teaching the ready-made forms of nouns

† See Trivandrum Sanskrit Series, No. 33.

influenced by the *etymological method* of यास्क. Then after noticing the chief characteristics of पाणिनि's अष्टाध्यायी it has been shown how पतञ्जलि lent a *scientific aspect to grammar* by adopting the categories of the वैशेषिकs and the *method of* अन्वय-व्यतिरेक belonging to the नैयायिकs. In this context we have seen that the grammarian's own method of analysing words through the direct observation of linguistic phenomena is essentially *inductive*, and that the same method should be followed, with proper limitations, in teaching grammar to young pupils. We have also shown how पतञ्जलि himself adopts in his भाष्य the *methods of etymology, dialogue, and induction.* It has then been pointed out that the system of पाणिनि was very popular with the Buddhists; yet in the absence of a topical arrangement in the अष्टाध्यायी, the study of the whole of पाणिनि's system became unduly long, difficult and tedious to students. Then it has been demonstrated that Sanskrit language has undergone several stages of growth and that at last it shows predilection for the *Nominal Style* rather than for the verbal style. Further, after indicating the main features of the nominal style we have shown how the *need of a new grammar like the* कातन्त्र suiting that style was quite natural, and how the कातन्त्र influenced the later grammarians in respect of the order of grammatical topics to be taught. We have then seen that the सिद्धान्तकौमुदी represents the last stage in the *evolution of the arrangement of*

topics, and that वरदराज in his three epitomes of the सिद्धान्तकौमुदी changed this order a little for the sake of beginners. वरदराज, of course, knew the importance of teaching *nouns before verbs;* yet he thought it necessary to *teach verbs side by side with nouns and before the teaching of participles.* Then after referring to the views of दयानन्दसरस्वती and stressing the importance of the *concentric method* in grammar teaching, we have shown that the tendency of teaching *ready-made forms at the initial stage,* as evidenced by some manuals, has grown stronger than that of teaching detailed word-formation, and that after the teaching of ready-made forms of words, young pupils, while reading literature, have been first led *to understand the* कारक *(case-relation),* which is the most important part of Sanskrit grammar. Lasly, the *Importance of concrete examples* in grammar teaching and the necessity of *unifying grammar and literature* have been emphasized by quoting actual instances of works representing the harmonization of both. In short, the valuable facts that can be derived from the foregoing treatment of Sanskrit grammar are as follows—

(i) Analysis of words (पदसंस्कार) in union with the etymological method is one of the many means of entering into their inner significance. Yet etymology is not the only method of approach to language; it must be made subservient to the understanding of the कारक relation in a sentence.

(ii) The order of grammatical topics to be taught should be in accordance with the Nominal Style of Sanskrit.

(iii) More stress should be laid on the teaching of 'कारक' than on that of verbs, and the detailed formation of verbs should be minimized so as to subserve the knowledge of कारक.

(iv) At the initial stage the teaching of ready-made forms of words should be more encouraged than detailed word-formation.

(v) Grammar should be taught in the light of literature, i. e., in association with concrete examples from literature.

(vi) The inductive method and the concentric method may beneficially be applied to the teaching of Sanskrit grammar. Their limitations, however, should be recognized.

VI. THE METHODS OF THE मीमांसा

It has been so far shown how the वैयाकरणs deal with words (पद) by employing their peculiar methods. It is now advisable to turn to the principles of interpreting a sentence (वाक्य) as propounded by the मीमांसकs. The मीमांसा, or more properly, the पूर्वमीमांसा or कर्ममीमांसा primarily institutes an inquiry into the 'धर्म' or duty, which is, according to the

मीमांसकs, the performance of sacrifices for the attainment of heaven. This sacrificial cult held its sway over the ancient Hindu society and induced particularly the sacrificial priests to hold discussions in assemblies or sacrificial sessions on doubtful points of ritualistic practices and on variations in them arising from divergent oral tradition. Again, the information about the details of sacrifices embodied in the संहिताs and ब्राह्मणs being scattered and unsystematic led to the divergence of opinions on this subject. It was जैमिनि who first organized all this confused mass of sacrificial lore and transformed it into a system by harmonizing all varying views, by deciding what was principal (शेषिन्, अङ्गिन्, प्रधान) and subordinate (शेष, अङ्ग, गौण), and by assigning a proper place to each of them in the sacrificial scheme. He discovered the laws of interpreting Vedic sentences which would guide one in the proper execution of sacrifices. As his method of interpretation was based mainly on reasoning, or properly, *deductive reasoning,* the मीमांसा system established by him was otherwise called 'न्याय'. It must be remembered that the term 'न्याय' was originally applied to the conclusive views rationally arrived at in each topic (अधिकरण) with its five parts,$ and was afterwards widely used to indicate the syllogistic reasoning in गौतम's system, which was later than the मीमांसा system. Thus each अधिकरण of the

$ विषय, संशय, पूर्वपक्ष, उत्तरपक्ष and सङ्गति.

पूर्वमीमांसा with its five parts, as formerly dealt with, afforded ample scope for the power of argumentation, subtile logical analysis, and clear and methodical exposition. This method of dealing with an अधिकरण was originally invented by the पूर्वमीमांसा and was also adopted later on in the उत्तरमीमांसा or वेदान्त, as a means of systematic exposition.

In later times, however, कुमारिल and प्रभाकर, the great exponents of the पूर्वमीमांसा system, were much influenced by the न्याय system of गौतम. Of them प्रभाकर recognizes the four means of proof (प्रमाण) belonging to the न्याय, viz., प्रत्यक्ष (Perception), अनुमान (Inference), उपमान (Analogy or comparison) and शब्द (Verbal testimony), and adds अर्थापत्ति (Presumption) to them as the fifth one; while कुमारिल accepting all these five means of proof adds अनुपलब्धि or अभाव (Non-apprehension or non-existence) to them as the sixth one. The मीमांसक्s include सम्भव (Probability) in अनुमान and ignore 'ऐतिह्य' (Tradition) of the पौराणिक्s and 'चेष्टा' (Gesture) of the तान्त्रिक्s. A special feature of the मीमांसक्s must be noted here that though they generally recognize the above प्रमाणs, they principally rely on the verbal testimony (शब्दप्रमाण) of the Veda. If the means of proof other than the 'verbal testimony' are admitted by them, they have been resorted to simply for proving the validity of the Vedic word. Thus though the later मीमांसक्s generally adopt Inference, the अन्वयव्यतिरेक method, and logical fallacies of the न्याय system, they employ them to

subserve the 'verbal testimony'. In other words, the principles of Logic are used by the मीमांसक्s only in order to give a rational interpretation of the Vedic sentences. Again, प्रभाकर admits *five* categories of the न्यायवैशेषिक system, viz., द्रव्य (Substance), गुण (Quality), कर्म (Action), सामान्य (Generality), and समवाय (Inherence), and adds to them शक्ति (Energy), सादृश्य (Similarity) and सङ्ख्या (Number); while कुमारिल recognizes only five categories of the न्यायवैशेषिक, viz., द्रव्य, गुण, कर्म, सामान्य and अभाव (Non-existence). Moreover, the मीमांसक्s generally accept the causal relation (कार्यकारणसम्बन्ध), though they differ from the न्यायवैशेषिक system as regards details. It will, therefore, be found that *the later मीमांसक्s have been influenced by the methodology of the न्यायवैशेषिक system in a broad outline.*

The पूर्वमीमांसा propounds that some transcendental result (अपूर्व), which is conducive to the attainment of heaven, comes into being by the correct performance of sacrifices. All the principal and subordinate acts of a sacrifice are, therefore, made by the मीमांसक्s subservient to this अपूर्व, which leads one to heaven. It can, therefore, be seen that the पूर्वमीमांसा places a *distinct goal or aim* before a person wishing to perform sacrifices. With this definite end in view it adopts the *classification* of things accessory to that end. It classifies the Vedic texts and sacrificial acts into main divisions and sub-divisions and adjusts *the principal and subordinate*

elements of the sacrificial lore in such a way that all of them should form a synthetic whole. All these are, of course, the distinctive features of methodology; and the process resorted to by the मीमांसकs in the interpretation of the Vedic texts is prominently *analytico-synthetic*. Thus though from the philosophical point of view the पूर्वमीमांसा is not very important, it can definitely be called 'a system' on account of its adoption of methodological principles in the interpretation of ritual texts. One may, perhaps, differ from the मीमांसकs in respect of their ideas of अपूर्व or heaven and the utility of sacrifices. Yet the *interpretative aspect* of their system is so very important that their principles of interpreting sentences (वाक्य) have deserved the honour of wider application to the religious as well as secular literature. Those principles have been particularly employed in the interpretation of Law (धर्मशास्त्र). शङ्कराचार्य, though he differs from the मीमांसकs as regards the ultimate reality of the world and the interpretation of the Upanishadic sentences relating to ब्रह्मन्, has accepted their कर्मन् (action) as conducive to the purification of the mind alone, and has made it subservient to the attainment of Self-knowledge. An important fact to be noted is that he utilizes the interpretative principles of the पूर्वमीमांसा every now and then, more particularly in the third chapter of his ब्रह्मसूत्रभाष्य for establishing the synthesis of Vedic sentences that lead to the Knowledge of ब्रह्मन्. Moreover, those interpretative

principles have been discussed at length in the Sanskrit Poetics (साहित्य) and have been more or less accepted by the Sanskrit literary critics. It has already been pointed out that the later grammarians too employ the principles of the मीमांसा in their works. It may, therefore, be said with certainty that *the interpretative side of the* पूर्वमीमांसा *has substantially contributed to the general linguistics by stressing the sentence-aspect of language* more than the etymological meanings (समाख्या) of detached words. It has properly demonstrated that etymology (and even comparative philology) is a futile process, unless the context of a sentence is taken into account. Another important linguistic principle of the मीमांसकs is that the *relation between a word and its meaning* being natural and eternal, the word is eternal, and that the word is not created but is simply manifested by the sound. The मीमांसकs lay down this principle mainly in order to estabiish their doctrine that the Vedas are eternal and not created by a human author. They further say that words in language primarily connote the genus (जाति, आकृति) and not an individual (व्यक्ति). Although the followers of कुमारिलभट्ट, who propound the theory of अभिहितान्वय (combination of significant words), say that detached words in language are meaningful, they never lose sight of the sentence-aspect of language. On the other hand, the प्राभाकर मीमांसकs, who uphold the theory of अन्विताभिधान (signification of syntactical combi-

nation), lay down the principle that words become meaningful only in the context of injunctive sentences and that they are mostly learnt according to the *usage of elders* (वृद्धव्यवहार) through sentences. In general, it may, therefore, be said that the मीमांसकs *hold a sentence to be the unit of language;* and this principle accords with the same Western principle of language-study. Again, both these schools of मीमांसा hold that the verb is the principal part of a sentence and in the verb too the affix (प्रत्यय) is the most important part. The value of these linguistic principles and their *bearings on language-teaching* will be detailed later on.† The fact worthy of note is that all these linguistic theories of the मीमांसकs evince *a sound method* of permanent value and have contributed much to the linguistic science.

Now in order to know the general nature of the methodology and interpretative principles of the मीमांसकs it is necessary to see how they classify the whole of the Veda into main divisions and subdivisions, and expound the rules of its interpretation so as to reach the goal aimed at. In the first place, according to the subject-matter of the Veda they divide it into five principal parts, viz., (1) विधि or injunctions laid down by the ब्राह्मण works, (2) मन्त्र or the Vedic texts which do not lay down injunctions but remind us of their meaning, when they are recited at the time of performing sacrifices, (3) नामधेय or names of sacrifices like

† See 'खण्डान्वय', Section X.

उद्भिद्, चित्रा, श्येन etc., (4) निषेध or prohibitions which are negative injunctions, and (5) अर्थवाद or passages which recommend or censure a thing and form a syntactical whole with the विधि or निषेध. Of these the विधि or injunction is the most important division to which other divisions are supplementary. It is, therefore, natural that the मीमांसक devote a major portion of their science to the elaborate treatment of the विधि and its sub-divisions.

A विधि commands a person to perform some action for the attainment of a desired object. For instance, the sentence 'स्वर्गकामो यजेत' impels a man to perform a sacrifice which would lead him to heaven, the most desired object. All such injunctive sentences are characterized by the verbal form like 'यजेत' which is usually in the potential mood (लिङ्). It is, therefore, the verbal form of the potential mood in an injunctive sentence (विधिवाक्य) that has the power to awaken an urge in the mind of a man to perform a sacrifice. The मीमांसक have shown minute skill in the analysis of this verbal form and in the *psychological exposition of the* भावना (energy or causing to come into being, भावयति–साधयति–करोति) indicated by the potential affix 'त'. They first divide the verb 'यजेत', which is the principal word in a sentence, into the root 'यज्' and the potential affix 'त', and further analyse the प्रत्यय 'त', the most important part of a sentence into two elements.

The first element is the general verbality (आख्यातत्व) which is common to all tenses and moods, and the other is the optativeness (लिङ्त्व) which is peculiar only to the potential mood. Both these elements of the same प्रत्यय indicate 'भावना', which is the particular activity in the agent, which is conducive to the production of a thing that is to come into existence. According to the मीमांसकs this भावना, contained in the affix 'त', is the principal psychological element or the centre to which every part of the Veda is somehow to be connected so as to serve some useful purpose. It can thus be seen that the 'भावना' is principally expressed by the affix 'त' to which the root 'यज्' is subordinate. Corresponding to the above two elements of the affix 'त' the 'भावना' (energy) too is of two sorts, viz., शाब्दी (verbal) and आर्थी (of the purpose or fruit). The optativeness (लिङ्त्व) indicates the शाब्दीभावना and the generel verbality (आख्यातत्व) indicates the आर्थी or फलभावना. The शाब्दीभावना is of the nature of प्रेरणा (instigation) which produces the आर्थीभावना which is of the nature of प्रवृत्ति (inclination) in the mind of a person. The relation, therefore, between the शाब्दीभावना and the आर्थीभावना.is respectively that of cause and effect, and hence the latter is subordinate to the former. In other words, the भावना latently existing in words produces a tendency (प्रवृत्ति) in a person to bring into being some action. Thus the आर्थीभावना or प्रवृत्ति further

causes the action of sacrifice (याग), denoted by the root-meaning of यज्, to come into being. If 'भावना' means 'that which causes something to come into being' (भावयति, साधयति, करोति), the meaning of the affix 'त' is 'भावयेत्' (should be brought into being). Both these भावनाs, which can be expressed by the verb 'भावयेत्' require, therefore, three factors in order to bring something into being, viz., the object or fruit (साध्य), the means (साधन) and the procedure (इतिकर्तव्यता), which correspondingly induce us to ask questions, as 'किं भावयेत्' (what), 'केन भावयेत्' (by what means) and 'कथं भावयेत्' (how). In short the भावना denoted by the verb 'भावयेत्' has the expectancy (आकाङ्क्षा) of साध्य, साधन and इतिकर्तव्यता; and this expectancy, which gives rise to the above questions in our mind, is fulfilled in the following way. In the case of the शाब्दीभावना, which is of the nature of instigation (प्रेरणा), the object (साध्य) is the आर्थी भावना or tendency (प्रवृत्ति) instigated, the means (साधन) is the knowledge of the potential, etc. (लिङादिज्ञान), and the mode of performance (इतिकर्तव्यता) is shown by the recommendatory texts (अर्थवादवाक्यs); while in the case of the आर्थीभावना the fruit or object (फल, साध्य) is 'heaven', the means is the 'sacrifice' (याग) which is known from the meaning of the root यज्, and the manner of performance is indicated by the several accessory rites (अङ्ग) of the sacrifice like 'प्रयाज' etc. Thus the whole

sentence 'यजेत स्वर्गकामः' is understood as equivalent to 'यागेन स्वर्गं भावयेत्' (One should bring heaven into being by performing the sacrifice). The example of a teacher and a pupil quoted in illustration of this two-fold भावना is note-worthy. The teacher says to his pupil 'गामानय' (Bring the cow). From the verb 'आनय' of the sentence used by the teachar the pupil undertands the motive, command or *instigation* (प्रेरणा) in the mind of the teacher and a *tendency* (प्रवृत्ति) is aroused in his own mind to perform the action of bringing the cow. Hence the treatment of the विधि which gives rise to the *psychological factor of 'भावना' is valuable from the linguistic point of view.* The भावना, which expresses itself in the form of प्रेरणा of the 'word' and प्रवृत्ति of a person, further evokes the three-fold आकाङ्क्षा (expectancy) which naturally arouses three questions. This concentration on the verbal part of a sentence and the eliciting of answers to the three questions through the verbal part establish the कारक relations of कर्म (object), करण (instrument) etc., of other words in the sentence with the verb. *In this entire psychological process is rooted the* खण्डान्वयपद्धति, *which is mainly a method of questions and answers* useful for the teaching of language, and which we shall discuss in detail later on. *

* See 'खण्डान्वय', Section X.

The विधि which thus results in the भावना is sub-divided into four classes: (1) उत्पत्तिविधि or originative injunction, (2) विनियोगविधि or injunction of application, (3) प्रयोगविधि or injunction of performance, and (4) अधिकारविधि or injunction of qualification.

(1) Of these the उत्पत्तिविधि merely indicates the general nature of a sacrificial act to be performed, as 'अग्निहोत्रं जुहोति' (He offers the अग्निहोत्र). This definition differentiates the उत्पत्तिविधि from other विधिs which indicate the relation of an accessory (i. e. गुणविधि) and the fruit (i. e. अधिकारविधि). In this विधि the object (कर्म) like 'अग्निहोत्रम्' with the root-meaning 'होम' is construed as the instrument (करण). Thus the whole sentence like 'अग्निहोत्रं जुहोति' is interpreted as 'अग्निहोत्रहोमेन इष्टं भावयेत्' (One should bring into being the desired thing by means of the अग्निहोत्र sacrifice). It is quite proper that the most desired thing (ईप्सिततम, इष्टतम) should be put in the objective case and the होम, which is the means (साधकतम) and which requires effort, should be put in the instrumental. In the Veda there are a few such उत्पत्तिविधिs which are independent of each other, yet are principal with reference to the other classes of the विधि which are subordinate. As they first generate the desire of performing sacrifices in one's mind, they are called उत्पत्तिविधिs.

(2) The second subdivision of the विधि is the विनियोगविधि or the applicatory injunction which intimates

the relation between the subordinate (अङ्ग) and the principal (प्रधान); as ' दध्ना जुहोति ' (One should sacrifice with curds). This sentence lays down the connection of the subsidiary thing ' curds ' with the principal thing ' sacrifice ' by means of the instrumental case of the word ' दधि ', and is interpreted as ' दध्ना होमं भावयेत् ' (One should bring into being the sacrifice by means of curds). In such a गुणविधि (injunction of the subsidiary) the root-meaning (i. e. होम) is construed as the object (कर्म) or that which is to be accomplished (साध्य). The various subsidiaries are the details of a sacrifice, such as, the substances (द्रव्य), the Vedic मन्त्रs, the deities and several sacrificial acts like the threshing of corn; while principal thing is the sacrifice, which is laid down by the उत्पत्तिविधि like ' अग्निहोत्रं जुहोति ', and which through the अपूर्व (transcendental result) leads to heaven. The विनियोगविधि, therefore, subordinates itself to the उत्पत्तिविधि which is principal, and lays down the details of the procedure to be followed in a sacrifice. This process of subordinating the details of a sacrifice to the उत्पत्तिविधि is carried on through six means of proof (प्रमाण), which are auxiliary to the विनियोगविधि. The six means of proof are: (i) श्रुति or direct statement, (ii) लिङ्ग–mark or word-meaning, (iii) वाक्य–syntactical connection or sentence, (iv) प्रकरण or context, (v) स्थान or position and (vi) समाख्या or name. The मीमांसकs have exhibited logical acumen in proving that each

preceding one of these प्रमाणs is stronger than each succeeding one; and the rules of interpretation enunciated by them in this respect not only indicate the relation of the subsidiary to the principal or of parts to the whole of a sacrifice, but are also *linguistically valuable for ascertaining the relative strength of the different parts of language and arriving at the correct interpretation of a literary or scientific work.*

(i) श्रुति—Now श्रुति is the direct statement or express declaration. It conveys its meaning directly without the aid of any intermediate steps which are necessary in the remaining five means of proof. This means of proof, which is the strongest of all, lays stress on the express meaning of words and sentences. The reason why श्रुति is stronger than लिङ्ग (mark) and other means of proof is that in the latter there is no direct statement which would make us instantly apply the subsidiary to the principal, but it has to be assumed or inferred from the sentence possessing the लिङ्ग etc. But before such an applicatory statement is inferred from the लिङ्ग and others, the direct statement which is already existing makes its immediate application, and the assumption or inference is rendered useless. For instance, in the verse 'कदाचन स्तरीरसि नेन्द्र सश्चसि दाशुषे' (O Indra, you never destroy him who offers you an oblation, but you favour him), there is the mention of Indra. On account of the suggestive word or mark 'इन्द्र' we might think that a statement like 'ऐन्द्या इन्द्र-

मुपतिष्ठते' should be assumed, and that the verse should be applied to the worship of Indra. But there already exists a direct statement 'ऐन्द्या गार्हपत्यमुपतिष्ठते' (One should worship the गार्हपत्य fire with the verse containing the mark of Indra), in which the word 'गार्हपत्यम्' in the accusative case makes us instantly apply that verse to the worship of the गार्हपत्य fire. For, श्रुति reaches the stage of application (विनियोग) through only one step of the denotation of its own sense (स्वाभिधेयप्रतिपादन); while लिङ्ग reaches the stage of application through two intermediate steps of स्वाभिधेयप्रतिपादन and श्रुतिकल्पना (assumption of a श्रुति). In other words, श्रुति being nearer विनियोग than लिङ्ग is stronger than the latter. Thus when there is a conflict between a direct statement (श्रुति) and a suggestive word or mark (लिङ्ग), the former prevails over the latter.

(ii) लिङ्ग—The power of a word to convey some meaning is called 'लिङ्ग'. In other words, the power of a word is the conventional sense (रूढि) itself. This लिङ्ग, therefore, which denotes the conventional or primary sense, must be differentiated from समाख्या (name) which conveys the etymological (यौगिक) or secondary sense. For instance, in the sentence 'बर्हिर्देवसदनं दामि' (I cut grass for the seat of the gods) the word 'बर्हिस्' may mean any kind of grass like कुश, उलप etc. But as it primarily denotes कुश grass and secondarily उलप grass, the primary sense is to be understood in the above

sentence and not the secondary one. The लिङ्ग (mark) becomes applicable when there is no direct statement (श्रुति) which has, of course, to be assumed from the लिङ्ग. This लिङ्ग is stronger than syntactical relation (वाक्य) and the succeeding means of proof. For instance, the मन्त्र "स्योनं ते सदनं कृणोमि घृतस्य धारया सुशेवं कल्पयामि। तस्मिन्सीदामृते प्रतितिष्ठ व्रीहीणां मेध सुमनस्यमानः॥" [O पुरोडाश, I make a pleasant seat for you, I make it acceptable to you with a stream of ghee; sit on it, rest on that immortal seat with pleasure, O marrow of the rice-grains] is a sentence containing two clauses 'स्योनं...कल्पयामि' and 'सीद...सुमनस्यमानः' which are joined by 'तस्मिन्'. The word 'तस्मिन्' gives rise to आकाङ्क्षा and we ask a question 'कस्मिन्' (where). This expectancy is fulfilled by the first clause which being syntactically connected with the second makes up the whole sentence. If we shall give prominence to this syntactical connection, we shall have to suppose that the whola मन्त्र as one sentence is to be repeated for making the seat of the पुरोडाश as well as for placing the पुरोडाश on that seat. In this case we shall have to suppose that instead of two clauses there is only one sentence which, as a whole, may be applied by cumulation (समुच्चय) or by option (विकल्प) to the two actions of 'making the seat' (सदन) and 'placing on it' (सादन). The मीमांसकs, however, forbid this, and say that only the first clause is to be used as subsidiary to the action

both the मन्त्रs will have to be construed by us without any direct statement to that effect. For this construing we shall have to assume, on the strength of the प्रकरण, that both the मन्त्रs form one sentence (वाक्य). Secondly, in the first मन्त्र, which properly refers to अग्नीषोमौ, we shall have to assume the लिङ्ग of इन्द्राग्नी. Thirdly, we shall have to infer a श्रुति enjoining upon us to perform the act relating to इन्द्राग्नी; and lastly, we shall reach the stage of विनियोग. Thus if we start from the प्रकरण, we reach the stage of विनियोग through the four steps of प्रकरण, वाक्य, लिङ्ग and श्रुति. If, on the other hand, the वाक्य is taken into account, the word 'अग्नीषोमौ' naturally forms a syntactical whole with the remaining part of the first मन्त्र, viz., 'इदं हवि...अक्राताम्', and we reach the stage of विनियोग through the three steps of वाक्य, लिङ्ग and श्रुति. Thus प्रकरण being more remote than वाक्य from विनियोग, the वाक्य sets aside the प्रकरण. It is then ascertained that the first मन्त्र is subsidiary only to the पूर्णमासयाग and the second only to the दर्शयाग.

Here it may incidentally be told that the दर्शपूर्णमास sacrifice is a primary form of the sacrifice or an archetype (प्रकृति) in which all the subsidiaries of the rite are stated; while 'सौर्य', 'श्येन' etc., are called 'modifications' (विकृति) where all the subsidiaries are not stated, and some that are not stated find their place in the विकृतिs by the *rule of transfer* (चोदक, अतिदशे) from the प्रकृति or arche-

type; that is, the subsidiaries belonging to the प्रकृति are transferred to the विकृतिs for their performance. The rule of transfer (अतिदेश) formulated by the मीमांसकs has, as we have already seen, been *used on a wider basis in grammar and other* शास्त्रs.

(iv) प्रकरण (context, topic) is defined as 'interdependence' or mutual expectancy of sentences. In other words, sentences mutually expectant (साकाङ्क्ष) of each other for the purpose of completing their unified sense make up a प्रकरण. Just as words in one sentence are expectant of one another for yielding a complete and unified sense of themselves, so several sentences in a प्रकरण are expectant of one another so as to yield a complete and unified sense of themselves. This mutual expectancy of sentences is called a प्रकरण. The प्रकरण may, therefore, correspond to a paragraph or a section on a particular subject. For instance, in the प्रकरण of दर्शपूर्णमास there are sentences, (1) 'दर्शपूर्णमासाभ्यां स्वर्गकामो यजेत' (One desirous of heaven should bring it into being by means of दर्शपूर्णमास) and (2) 'समिधो यजति' (He should bring it into being by means of the समिध् sacrifice), which are connected with the प्रयाज, the subsidiary of दर्शपूर्णमास. Both these sentences are expectant of each other. The first sentence has the expectancy as to *how* स्वर्ग is to be brought into being (कथंभावाकाङ्क्षा, उपकारकाकाङ्क्षा), and it is fulfilled by the second sentence; while the second sentence has the expectancy as to *what* is

to be brought into being by means of the समिध् sacrifice (साध्याकाङ्क्षा, उपकार्याकाङ्क्षा), and it is fulfilled by the first sentence which indicates the fruit 'स्वर्ग'. Thus both these expectant sentences form the प्रकरण of दर्शपूर्णमास, of which the दर्शपूर्णमासविधि laid down by the first sentence is principal (अङ्गिन्), to which the प्रयाजविधि laid down by the second sentence is subordinate (अङ्ग).

The प्रकरण (topic, context) is stronger than स्थान (proximity or position). For instance, in the प्रकरण of राजसूय sacrifice many sacrifices like पशुयागs and सोमयागs have been prescribed. Among them is mentioned a सोमयाग called 'अभिषेचनीय' in the proximity (सांनिध्य) of which acts like gambling etc., are stated in the sentences 'अक्षैर्दीव्यति, राजन्यं जिनाति, शौनःशेपमाख्यापयति' [He should play at dice, he should conquer kings, he should cause the legend of शुनःशेप to be told]. As these acts occur in the proximity of the अभिषेचनीय, it appears at first sight that they are the subsidiaries of the अभिषेचनीय. But the अभिषेचनीय being a modification (विकृति) of ज्योतिष्टोम has no expectancy about the procedure (कथंभावाकाङ्क्षा); for, the subsidiaries from the प्रकृति 'ज्योतिष्टोम' are to be transferred to the विकृति, and thus no expectancy (आकाङ्क्षा) is left. On the other hand, the विधि "राजा स्वाराज्यकामो राजसूयेन यजेत = राजसूयेन यागेन स्वाराज्यं भावयेत्" [A king desirous of heaven's sovereignty should bring it into being by means of the राजसूय

sacrifice] in the actual राजसूयप्रकरण in hand gives rise to the expectancy as to *how* it [स्वाराज्य] should be brought into being (कथंभावाकाङ्क्षा); and that expectancy is satisfied by the sentences 'अक्षैर्दीव्यति...आख्यापयति'; again, the expectancy roused by these sentences as to *what* should be brought into being (साध्याकाङ्क्षा) is satisfied by 'स्वाराज्यकामो...यजेत'. Both of them thus depending upon each other form a प्रकरण. On the strength of the actual प्रकरण, therefore, the acts like gambling etc., become the subsidiaries of the राजसूय and not of the अभिषेचनीय on the strength of their proximity (स्थान). If प्रकरण is taken into account, we can reach the stage of विनियोग through प्रकरण, वाक्य, लिङ्ग and श्रुति; while if we pay attention to स्थान, we add one more step and reach the stage of विनियोग through स्थान, प्रकरण, वाक्य, लिङ्ग and श्रुति. Thus प्रकरण being nearer to विनियोग than स्थान is stronger than the latter.

(v) स्थान (position) means common location (देशसामान्य) or order of succession (क्रम). It is of two kinds: common location according to the text (पाठसादेश्य) and common location according to the performance (अनुष्ठानसादेश्य). पाठसादेश्य is again subdivided into 'the text according to number' (यथासङ्ख्यपाठ) and 'text according to proximity' (संनिधिपाठ). This स्थान is stronger than 'name' or a word which conveys the etymological sense (समाख्या). In the दर्शपूर्णमासप्रकरण there is a section,

which gives information about 'पुरोडाश', and is, therefore, called 'पौरोडाशिक'. 'पौरोडाशिक' (related to the पुरोडाश) is a name(समाख्या), which is etymologically formed by applying a तद्धितप्रत्यय to the word 'पुरोडाश'. That section also mentions सांनाय्यपात्रs (vessels for milk and curds) and पुरोडाशपात्रs (implements like the pestle, mortar etc., required for the पुरोडाश). The same section again gives a मन्त्र about the purification of the vessels, as 'शुन्धध्वं दैव्याय कर्मणे' (O vessels, become purified for the divine rite). Here we have to decide whether the सांनाय्यपात्रs are to be purified with this मन्त्र or the पुरोडाशपात्रs. If we rely on the समाख्या of the word 'पौरोडाशिक', the मन्त्र will have to be used while purifying the सांनाय्यपात्रs as well as the पुरोडाशपात्रs, as they all occur in the same पौरोडाशिक section. But if the position or common location of the मन्त्र is taken into consideration, we find that the मन्त्र occurs in the proximity of the सांनाय्यपात्रs. It should, therefore, be used in connection with the purification of the सांनाय्यपात्रs and not of the पुरोडाशपात्रs, though it occurs in the पौरोडाशिक काण्ड. The स्थान is evidently nearer to the विनियोग than the समाख्या. This actual position or proximity of the मन्त्र is more directly known by us than the position of it inferred from समाख्या. स्थान is, therefore, a stronger means of proof than समाख्या.

(vi) समाख्या or 'name' is the last and the weakest of all the six means of proof. As already

explained, समाख्या is a word which depends upon etymology for its meaning. This समाख्या becomes subordinately useful for determining which parts of the sacrifice are to be performed by whom. For instance, the समाख्याs 'हौत्रम्,' 'आध्वर्यवम्' and 'औद्गात्रम्' help us in settling respectively that some parts of the sacrifice are to be performed by the होतृ priest of the ऋग्वेद, some by the अध्वर्यु priest of the यजुर्वेद and some by the उद्गातृ priest of the सामवेद. The समाख्या 'होतृचमस' shows that the सोम juice contained in the चमस (cup) is to be drunk by the होतृ priest. In other words, we can determine the विनियोग (application) that the होतृ becomes the subsidiary to the drinking of the सोम from the cup. It should be remembered that the समाख्या is to be adopted as the last resort when other means of proof fail. The मीमांसा has rightly given the last place to समाख्या in the matter of interpretation. This principle is of far-reaching importance and *deserves to be well borne in mind by the etymologists and philologists who deal with detached words* bereft of their relation in a sentence or paragraph. A somewhat detailed treatment of the above six प्रमाणs of the विनियोगविधि is purposely adopted here on account of their *linguistic importance and general application to other* शास्त्रs. Besides, the विनियोगविधि, which shows *the relative value of the principal and subsidiary,* is *a distinctive feature of the methodology of the*

मीमांसकs. It may also be added that the विनियोगविधि is calculated to *guide a teacher* in determining the principal and subordinate parts of a text to be interpreted and in giving him *a proper perspective of the subject-matter* which he is preparing for presentation.

(3) Now the प्रयोगविधि or injunction of performance is a natural development of the विनियोगविधि, since what is determined to be subordinate and principal by the विनियोगविधि is actually performed or brought into practice according to the प्रयोगविधि by following the order of succession in the various acts of the sacrifice, so that the speedy performance of the acts enjoined should be facilitated without unnecessary delay. The प्रयोगविधि thus tells us how the subordinate and principal acts are to be combined into an organic whole and what subsidiaries are to succeed what according to their order of succession. When several sentences indicative of the principal and subordinate acts are combined, there emerges from them one syntactical whole or महावाक्य, the combined meaning of which is the प्रयोगविधि itself. If this syntactical whole is to be maintained, the various acts of a sacrifice will have to be performed briskly or without delay. For, delay in action prevents us from realizing the unification or association that a particular thing is connected with another, and the syntactical unity pre-determined by us is spoiled. It is for this reason that connected or uninterrupted performance

of acts in their definite order (क्रम) is enjoined by the प्रयोगविधि, which is, therefore, also defined as the विधि laying down the order of the subsidiaries. This order is a particular kind of extension (विततिविशेष) or the sequence (पौर्वापर्य) of acts, according to which we know which thing should succeed which. In this प्रयोगविधि too there are six means of proof which are instrumental in deciding the order in which various acts of the sacrifice should be performed. They are : (i) श्रुतिक्रम or order determined by direct enunciation, (ii) अर्थक्रम or order determined by purpose, (iii) पाठक्रम or order in the text, (iv) स्थानक्रम or order according to position, (v) मुख्यक्रम or order based on the principal matter, and (vi) प्रवृत्तिक्रम or order by procedure. Here also each preceding प्रमाण prevails over the succeeding one. This discussion of order is also calculated to be *helpful to teachers* in deciding which step in their actual procedure of teaching should follow which.

(4) The अधिकारविधि (injunction of qualification) is that which indicates the ownership or the right of enjoyment of the fruit resulting from an action. The sentence ' यजेत स्वर्गकामः ' is an example of this विधि, because it intimates that the man desirous of the fruit ' heaven ' becomes the enjoyer of it by means of a sacrifice. Corresponding to the distinction of कर्मन्s into काम्य (performed with a special desire), नैमित्तिक (occasional) and नित्य (daily) the

three *qualifications* (अधिकार) *required by the* per-former of a rite are respectively फलकामना (the desire for a particular result or fruit), निमित्तनिश्चय (ascertainment of the occasion) and शुचिविहितकाल-जीवित्व (leading a pure life and performing duties at the fixed times.) The three more qualifications added to these are विद्या (study and knowledge of the Veda), अग्निमत्ता (the laying of fires) and सामर्थ्य (competency). As every शास्त्र discusses the particular qualifications of the person resorting to it, so it is natural for the पूर्वमीमांसा to enumerate the *qualifications* required *by the performer* of a rite. Although the above qualifications are special to the पूर्वमीमांसा, yet leaving aside their particular senses, if we take their general senses, it will not *be too far-fetched to apply those qualifications* except ' अग्निमत्ता ' to any person given to worthy pursuits and to a teacher. A teacher too should have a desire to achieve a definite result, should ascertain special occasions, should lead a pure life and perform his duties at the fixed times, should possess a sound knowledge of his subject and have competency to impart it to others.

So far we have dealt with the four chief classes of विधि, viz., उत्पत्तिविधि, विनियोगविधि, प्रयोगविधि and अधिकार-विधि. The विधि is again classified on a different basis into अपूर्वविधि, नियमविधि and परिसङ्ख्याविधि, all of which tell us whether we should execute a command in them *wholly* or *partially*. The following verse describes the general nature of these three विधिs—

विधिरत्यन्तमप्राप्तौ, नियमः पाक्षिके सति ।
तत्र चान्यत्र च प्राप्तौ परिसङ्ख्येति गीयते ॥

" The विधि or अपूर्वविधि (a new injunction) occurs when something is wholly non-existent; the नियमविधि (a restrictive injunction) occurs when something is partially non-existent; and the परिसङ्ख्याविधि (exclusive specification) occurs when, out of two alternatives equally existent or present, one is excluded." In other words, the अपूर्वविधि lays down something new (अपूर्व) which is not established by any other means of proof. When, out of many means, by which an action can be performed, one means is naturally present, while the other is not present, the नियमविधि restricts us to the use of that other which is not present. 'व्रीहीनवहन्ति' (He should beat the rice-grains) is an example of the नियमविधि. This sentence is not meant to indicate that the husk of grains can be removed by beating. It being a matter of common experience that when the rice-grains are beaten, the husks are removed from them, and when they are not beaten, the husks are not removed, a special sentence laying down this injunction is unnecessary. The real purpose of the sentence is, however, to restrict us to a means which is not present. We can remove the husk either by नखविदलन (separating with finger-nails) or by अवहनन (beating). Out of these two means if we suppose that the alternative of नखविदलन is naturally present (पक्षे प्राप्त) and that of अवहनन is not present (पक्षे अप्राप्त), then the sentence

'व्रीहीनवहन्ति' restricts us to अवहनन only and is, therefore, the example of the नियमविधि.

When two alternatives are simultaneously present (युगपत्प्राप्त), the परिसङ्ख्याविधि excludes one of them. 'पञ्च पञ्चनखाः भक्ष्याः [Five five--nailed animals are to be eaten] is the stock example of परिसङ्ख्या (exclusion). It is not meant to lay down the eating of five-nailed animals. For, it is generally found that men are naturally inclined without any discrimination to eat the flesh of all animals, five-nailed ones (पञ्चनख) as well as those that do not possess five nails (अपञ्चनख). Both the eating of five-nailed animals (पञ्चनखभक्षण) and the eating of those without five nails (अपञ्चनखभक्षण) are, therefore, simultaneously present owing to the natural inclination (रागतः प्राप्त) of man. As पञ्चनखभक्षण is not wholly non-existent (अत्यन्त अप्राप्त), and as no new injunction is necessary when something is done out of natural inclination, the sentence 'पञ्च पञ्चनखाः भक्ष्याः' cannot be an example of अपूर्वविधि. Nor is it an example of नियमविधि, because पञ्चनखभक्षण is not partially non-existent. (पक्षे अप्राप्त), but is wholly existent or established (प्राप्त). Human beings allay their hunger by means of पञ्चनखभक्षण as well as अपञ्चनखभक्षण, which both are simultaneously existent or present (युगपत्प्राप्त). According to the principle of residuum (परिशेष), therefore, the sentence 'पञ्च पञ्चनखाः भक्ष्याः' must be an example of परिसङ्ख्या (exclusion). This विधि then wants us to desist from

अपञ्चनखभक्षण which is other than पञ्चनखभक्षण. The eating of five-nailed animals (पञ्चनखभक्षण) has thus to be understood as equivalent to the exclusion of the animals that are not five-nailed (अपञ्चनखभक्षण-निवृत्ति). Now 'पञ्च पञ्चनखाः भक्ष्याः' is an example of *implied exclusion* (लाक्षणिकी परिसङ्ख्या), as the word 'एव' (only) is not directly stated in it; while 'अत्र हि एव आवपन्ति' (Here only, i. e., in the three verses of पवमानस्तोम alone they should insert extra words) is an example of *expressed exclusion* (श्रौती परिसङ्ख्या), as the word 'एव' is directly stated in it. The implied exclusion involves three faults, viz., श्रुतहानि (abandonment of the direct sense), अश्रुत-कल्पना (assumption of what is not directly stated), and प्राप्तबाध (rejection of what is already existing or present). For instance, in understanding the sense 'अपञ्चनखभक्षणनिवृत्ति' from 'पञ्चनखभक्षण' we abandon the direct sense of पञ्चनखभक्षण, assume another sense 'अपञ्चनखभक्षणनिवृत्ति' which is not directly stated, and also reject 'अपञ्चनखभक्षण' which is already established by natural inclination. The श्रौती परिसङ्ख्या in 'अत्र ह्येवावपन्ति', however, involves only one fault of प्राप्तबाध on account of the direct statement of 'एव'. It is necessary to understand these details of the नियमविधि and परिसङ्ख्याविधि, as both of them are *general rules of interpretation widely used in other* शास्त्रs, *particularly in grammar and law.*

After this treatment of the विधि, the first main division of the Veda, it is now advisable to turn to

the remaining four main divisions of the same, viz., मन्त्र, नामधेय, निषेध and अर्थवाद, which are subordinately helpful to the विधि in one way or another. Of them the मन्त्रs or sacred formulas remind us of the meanings of things connected with sacrifices. When this is their visible purpose (दृष्टफलकत्व), it is improper to assume an invisible result (अदृष्ट-कल्पना) of their recitation. As every part of the Veda is considered to be purposeful or meaningful, the 'Names' (नामधेय) which are words (proper nouns) rather than sentences, are also useful in making definite the character of a sacrifice to be performed. The मीमांसकs purposely accept this division (i. e. नामधेय) of the Veda for four reasons: (i) There is the danger of resorting to possessive implication (मत्वर्थ-लक्षणाभय); (ii) there is the danger of adopting the syntactical split (वाक्यभेदभय) or the fault of understanding a single sentence as enjoining two different things at once; (iii) there is another scriptural text prescribing an accessory (तत्प्रख्यशास्त्र); and (iv) there is comparison with another thing (तद्व्यपदेश). The मीमांसकs have exhibited subtle analytical power in the discussion of these four reasons. It may incidentally be pointed out that the avoidance of the वाक्यभेद is an important principle used in law.

The fourth division of the Veda is 'निषेध' (a negative injunction or prohibition) which is a sentence turning a man away from some action that causes an undesirable result. Just as a

विधि like 'यजेत स्वर्गकामः' suggests that a man performing a sacrifice would achieve a desirable result, and *impels* (प्रवर्तयति) him to perform the sacrifice, so a निषेध like 'न कलञ्जं भक्षयेत्' (One should not eat meat stuck with a poisoned arrow) suggests that the eating of poisoned flesh leads to an undesirable result and *turns* a man *away from* (निवर्तयति) that action. The मीमांसक have shown much insight into language by discussing whether the negative word 'नञ्' is to be construed with the potential affix or the root-meaning or a noun; and this topic has much bearing on the interpretation of sentences. In the निषेध the negative word 'नञ्' is generally to be construed with the potential affix which expresses भावना. It has already been shown that the verb is the principal element in a sentence and that in the verb too the potential affix expressing भावना is more important. It has also been seen that a verb contains two elements, viz., the root-meaning (धात्वर्थ) and the meaning of the affix (प्रत्ययार्थ). The root-meaning 'eating' (भक्षण) in the verb 'भक्षयेत्' is subordinately related as an instrument (साधन) to the principal element, i. e., the affix, which expresses भावना, as the verb 'भक्षयेत्' is equivalent to 'भक्षणेन इष्टं भावयेत्'. Thus the root-meaning 'भक्षण' which is subordinate (उपसर्जनीभूत) cannot be construed with 'नञ्', since a subordinate word cannot be construed independently of the principal

word with some other word. For instance, in the sentence 'राजपुरुषमानय' (Bring the king's man) the subordinate word 'राजन्' cannot be construed with 'आनय' independently of the principal word 'पुरुष'. The 'नञ्', therefore, cannot go with the root-meaning 'भक्षण' which is subordinate, but can go with the potential affix which is principal. Again, as we have already seen, the affix contains two elements, आख्यातत्व (general verbality) and लिङ्त्व (optativeness), which both express respectively आर्थी भावना and शाब्दी भावना; and the आर्थी भावना is subordinately related as साध्य (object) to the शाब्दी भावना which is principal. The 'नञ्' is, therefore, to be construed with the principal element 'शाब्दी भावना' or प्रवर्तना and not with the subordinate element 'आर्थी भावना'. Now the nature of 'नञ्' is such that it expresses the opposite of the thing with which it is logically connected. Just as in the sentence 'घटो नास्ति' (There is no jar) the word 'न' connected with 'अस्ति' shows the 'non-existence of the jar' which is opposite to 'the existence of the jar,' so the 'नञ्' connected with the लिङर्थ (the optative) expressing प्रवर्तना (instigation) shows निवर्तना (the turning away from), which is opposite to the प्रवर्तना of the लिङर्थ. Thus if the sense of an injunctive sentence (विधिवाक्य) is प्रवर्तना (instigation to an action), the sense of a prohibitive sentence (निषेध-वाक्य) is निवर्तना (turning away from an action).

Hence, when 'नञ्' in a sentence goes with the optative affix, the sentence is called 'प्रतिषेध.'

But two difficulties come in the way of construing 'नञ्' with the affix. The first difficulty occurs in the case of some vows to be performed; and the second is that if a sentence is understood as a निषेध, there is the contingency of an option (विकल्प) which is a fault. In order to remove these difficulties the 'नञ्' will have to be construed either with the root-meaning or with a noun, in which case the sense of the negative is called a पर्युदास (exclusion). As regards the first difficulty, it may be said that a स्नातक has to practise some vows, of which 'नेक्षेतोद्यन्तमादित्यम्' (He should not look at the rising sun) is one. Now a vow (व्रत) is a thing that is to be practised or that partakes of the character of a positive command; while the निषेध is simply निवर्तना which cannot be practised. The 'नञ्' has, therefore, to be construed in the case of this पर्युदास with the root-meaning 'looking at' (ईक्षण). We then get the sense 'ईक्षणाभाव' (absence of looking at), which by implication (लक्षणा) means 'ईक्षणाभावसङ्कल्प' (the resolution of not looking at). The sentence 'नेक्षेतोद्यन्तमादित्यम्' is then equivalent to 'आदित्यविषयकानीक्षणसङ्कल्पेन...भावयेत्' [He should bring into being...by the resolution of not looking at the sun]. Here, we have the expectancy of साध्य (object) which is fulfilled by the supplementary sentence (वाक्यशेष) 'एतावता ह एनसा वियुक्तो भवति' [He

becomes free from so much sin]. This वाक्यशेष, which yields the sense of 'पापक्षय' (removal of sin) and becomes the साध्य, forms a syntactical whole with 'नेक्षेतोद्यन्तमादित्यम्', and the whole then means 'आदित्यविषयकानीक्षणसङ्कल्पेन पापक्षयं भावयेत्' [He should bring into being the removal of sin by observing the vow of not looking at the sun]. This becomes, therefore, a पर्युदास or a positive command tinged with negation.

The second *difficulty* is the contingency of an option in the case of understanding a sentence as a निषेध. In order to avoid this contingency it is sometimes necessary to resort to a पर्युदास, the instance of which is found in 'यजतिषु ये-यजामहं करोति, नानुयाजेषु (ये-यजामहं करोति)' [He should say 'ये यजामहे' in the याज्याs but not in the अनुयाजs]. It has been settled by the मीमांसकs that the होतृ-priest should first utter the words 'ये यजामहे' at the places where oblations are to be offered after the अध्वर्यु's command 'यज', and then he should recite the याज्याs (sacrificial formulas). Again, it has been stated that the words 'ये यजामहे' are not to be added before the मन्त्रs for the अनुयाजs (three offerings of ghee).

Here the *prima facie* view is that the first part 'यजतिषु ये-यजामहं करोति' expresses a विधि; while if in the latter part 'नानुयाजेषु (ये-यजामहं करोति)' 'न' is construed with the affix in 'करोति' (understood), 'नानुयाजेषु' etc. expresses a प्रतिषेध, which prohibits what is already established (प्राप्त) by the विधि in the

first part. This प्रतिषेध then means: "He should not say 'ये यजामहे' in the अनुयाजs." As we have here two scriptural texts of equal force opposing each other, there is an *option* (विकल्प) as to what is to be done and *no annulment* (बाध). For, a बाध occurs when a passion (for the murder of a ब्राह्मण, for instance) is already existent (प्राप्त) and when it is annulled by a stronger scriptural passage (as, ब्राह्मणो न हन्तव्यः). As this is not the case with the विधि and निषेध in 'यजतिषु ये-यजामहं करोति, नानुयाजेषु', i. e., as both the विधि and निषेध are of equal force, we should take this as an option (विकल्प) instead of बाध. Again, two scriptural passages which are mutually independent can annul each other; and then a बाध would take place. But the निषेध in 'न अनुयाजेषु' is dependent on the preceding विधि in 'यजतिषु०' etc., for the completion of its own meaning and for the establishment of what is prohibited. When, therefore, one scriptural passage prohibits what is laid down by another scriptural passage, only विकल्प is possible and not बाध, as both the passages are authoritative.

The *conclusive view* is that it is not proper to assume a विकल्प here, as both the scriptural texts become unauthoritative thereby. In other words, if it is held that 'यजतिषु ये-यजामहं करोति' is true, the words-'ये-यजामहं करोति' used with 'नानुयाजेषु' become unauthoritative. A विकल्प should, therefore, be avoided as far as possible, as it involves faults. Again,

in the case of a विकल्प we have to assume a double unseen result (अपूर्व), one for a विधि and another for a प्रतिषेध, since the विधि and the प्रतिषेध in the present instance would be for the good of man(पुरुषार्थ) and not for the sake of the rite (क्रत्वर्थ). 'नानुयाजेषु ये–यजामहं करोति' should, therefore, be understood as a पर्युदास (exception) by construing 'नञ्' with 'अनुयाजेषु', and not as a प्रतिषेध (negation), where 'नञ्' is construed with the affix in 'करोति'. When we thus resort to पर्युदास and construe 'नञ्' with 'अनुयाजेषु', the words 'न + अनुयाजेषु' are by लक्षणा equivalent to अनुयाजव्यतिरिक्तेषु ' (to the exclusion of the अनुयाजs), and the whole sentence 'नानुयाजेषु ये–यजामहं करोति' means 'अनुयाजव्यतिरिक्तेषु यजतिषु ये–यजामह इति मन्त्रं कुर्यात् (He should use the मन्त्र 'ये यजामहे' with the याज्याs which are excluded by the अनुयाजs). Thus when we take this as a पर्युदास, the opposition between two scriptural texts of equal force occuring in the विकल्प does not arise. In this पर्युदास 'ये–यजामह' is not a new विधि, but is simply an allusion (अनुवाद) to what has been laid down in the general rule 'यजतिषु ये–यजामहं करोति'; and this अनुवाद is resorted to only in order to make an exception in the case of the अनुयाजs.

It is thus found that a पर्युदास (exclusion) restricts a general rule. An उपसंहार (restriction) too does the same; yet the difference between both of them is that a पर्युदास restricts a general rule only to what is *other than* the particular case stated in the

पर्युदास; while an उपसंहार restricts a general rule only to the particular case that is stated in the उपसंहार itself. Again, a पर्युदास is negative, while an उपसंहार is positive. For instance, the four-fold division of पुरोडाश mentioned in the general rule 'पुरोडाशं चतुर्धा करोति' (He divides the पुरोडाश into four parts) is restricted only to the 'आग्नेय पुरोडाश' owing to the particular sentence, 'आग्नेयं चतुर्धा करोति' (He divides the आग्नेय पुरोडाश into four parts), which is an example of उपसंहार.

In spite of the contingency of the faulty विकल्प, we have sometimes inevitably to resort to प्रतिषेध (prohibition) rather than to पर्युदास. पर्युदास is an exception to प्रतिषेध; but the प्रतिषेध resorted to in such a case is an exception to the पर्युदास, i. e., प्रतिप्रसव (an exception to an exception). In the अतिरात्र (a form of ज्योतिष्टोम sacrifice) there are two sentences, of which 'अतिरात्रे षोडशिनं गृह्णाति' (At the अतिरात्र he should take the षोडशिन् cup) is a विधि, and 'नातिरात्रे षोडशिनं गृह्णाति' (At the अतिरात्र he should not take the षोडशिन् cup) is a निषेध. A विकल्प which is faulty is, therefore, contingent here. If it is to be avoided, we have to resort to पर्युदास, in which 'नञ्' will have to be construed with either of the nouns 'अतिरात्रे' or 'षोडशिनम्'. Then the second (negative) sentence will respectively assume the form of either 'अतिरात्रव्यतिरिक्ते षोडशिनं गृह्णाति' (He should take the षोडशिन् at the sacrifices other than the अतिरात्र)

or 'अतिरात्रे षोडशिव्यतिरिक्तं गृह्णाति' (He should take the cups other than the षोडशिन् at the अतिरात्र). As both these meanings are quite contrary to the विधि 'अतिरात्रे षोडशिनं गृह्णाति', it is impossible to assume a पर्युदास here. Hence, by construing नञ् with the प्रत्ययार्थ the sentence 'नातिरात्रे षोडशिनं गृह्णाति' must inevitably be taken to be a प्रतिषेध (prohibition) of 'अतिरात्रे षोडशिनं गृह्णाति', although there is the contingency of विकल्प in this. It has already been shown that a प्रतिषेध like 'न कलञ्जं भक्षयेत्' prohibits that which leads us to an undesirable result (अनर्थ). In other words, this प्रतिषेध is meant for the good of man (पुरुषार्थ). But the प्रतिषेध of taking the षोडशिन् cup does not lead us to an undesirable result, as it is laid down for the sake of the sacrifice (क्रत्वर्थ), and not for the good of man (पुरुषार्थ). The विकल्प, therefore, that has to be admitted on account of this प्रतिषेध is not faulty. There are two classes of विकल्प, viz., व्यवस्थित (fixed or limited) and अव्यवस्थित (unlimited). The विकल्पs which are fixed or which depend upon the will of the agent are not faulty. The nice distinction made by the मीमांसकs between प्रतिषेध and पर्युदास or between पर्युदास and उपसंहार, is very useful for interpreting negative sentences in literature in general, and Sanskrit literature in particular. Although the मीमांसकs lay more stress on the potential form (विधिलिङ्) of verbs in this respect, the principles of विधि and निषेध may generally be made applicable to the verbs in the indicative mood also.

The fifth and last division of the Veda is अर्थवाद (explanatory or supplementary statement) which praises a thing laid down by a विधि and censures a thing prohibited by a निषेध. Although the अर्थवादs in the ब्राह्मणs consist of lengthy and imaginary stories, legends, etc., and sometimes contain descriptions of impossible or fanciful things, they are not meaningless. For, instead of understanding them in their literal or primary sense, we have to interpret them by resorting to implication (लक्षणा). Being taken in its implied sense an अर्थवाद is connected with the शाब्दी-भावना (verbal energy) in a विधि or निषेध, and praising or censuring a thing contained in either of them, it expresses the manner of performance (इतिकर्तव्यता) of a rite. The अर्थवाद thus becomes meaningful when it forms a syntactical whole (एकवाक्यता) with the विधि or निषेध laid down in the Veda. For instance, 'वायुर्वै क्षेपिष्ठा देवता' (वायु is indeed the swiftest deity) is an अर्थवाद, the purpose of which is not merely to denote its own primary sense, but to become meaningful by praising the thing enjoined in the विधि 'वायव्यं श्वेतमालभेत भूतिकामः' (One desirous of prosperity should sacrifice a white animal to वायु), and by subordinately forming a syntactical whole with that विधि which is principal. The अर्थवादs implying censure, of course, form a syntactical whole with a निषेध. As thus अर्थवादs indirectly impel a man to perform an action stated in a विधि, or turn him away from a

thing prohibited in a निषेध, they are more connected with the शाब्दी भावना than with the आर्थी भावना.

अर्थवाद is of three kinds: गुणवाद (a figurative statement), अनुवाद (a corroborative statement) and भूतार्थवाद (a statement of the past).

(i) गुणवाद, taken in its primary sense, contradicts some other means of proof; but, understood in its secondary or figurative sense, it implies similarity or identity of a *quality*. In the sentence 'आदित्यो यूपः' (The sacrificial post is the sun) the identity between 'आदित्य' and 'यूप' contradicts Perception (प्रत्यक्षप्रमाण); yet both of them are said to be identical on account of the common quality of 'brightness'. The sense of the sentence is that the sacrificial post is as bright as the sun; and this sense is obtained by adopting लक्षणा (implication).

(ii) अनुवाद reiterates or corroborates what is already existing or what is ascertained by other means of proof like Perception. The sentence 'अग्निर्हिमस्य भेषजम्' (Fire is an antidote against cold) is in praise of अग्नि; yet, it is the statement of an already existing fact that fire protects us from cold.

(iii) भूतार्थवाद neither contradicts other means of proof nor corroborates them, but simply states what is said to have taken place in the past. The sentence 'इन्द्रो वृत्राय वज्रमुदयच्छत्' (इन्द्र lifted his thunderbolt against वृत्र) is an instance of this variety.

An अर्थवाद may comprise a sentence or passage in the form of a story, description, allegory, etc.; yet it is always to be formed into a synthetic whole with the विधि. The wider meaning of this principle may be understood that subordinate parts of a sentence or passage in literature and शास्त्रs are always to be unified with the main sentence or idea of an author. As in such sentences or main ideas the *intention* or *purport* of an author (वक्तृतात्पर्य) is centred, the various concrete, illustrative, artistic and persuasive ways of expression adopted by him to arrive at the main idea should, in interpretation, be naturally construed with his purport, so that the *synthetic meaning* of that author would be clearly grasped. It is noteworthy here that in consonance with the principle of अर्थवाद the अभिहितान्वय school of the मीमांसा, with this synthetic purpose in view, emphasizes the तात्पर्यवृत्ति, which will be dealt with later on.

We have so far given a summary of the most important *principles of interpretation* propounded by the मीमांसकs, leaving all the minute details. Those principles have been summarized here in such a manner that they might be seen in their proper perspective and their importance from a new point of view might be realized. There is, of course, twofold purpose in giving this summary. The first purpose is to show how the मीमांसकs too in their particular science *have followed the general principles of methodology*. In other words, it is

shown here how the मीमांसक्s determine *the subordinate and principal elements* of their cult, how they exhibit *distinctness and unity of purpose* (i. e. धर्म), how they unite the subordinate and principal elements with that purpose and how they organize *all the elements into a synthetic whole or a system.* In this process they first classify their subject-matter into minor and major parts and then develop it into a synthetic whole. As thus the methodology of the मीमांसक्s is *analytico-synthetic* like that of the other शास्त्रs, it evidently deserves a prominent place in the survey of general methodology. The second purpose is to present in a nutshell the principles of interpretation belonging to the मीमांसक्s, as they have substantially contributed to the general linguistics and merit wider application. It is actually found that almost all the above laws of interpretation, particularly those of विनियोगविधि, निषेध, नियम, परिसङ्ख्या and अर्थवाद, which lay due *strees on the sentence-aspect of language,* i. e., which make individual words subordinate to a sentence, have been *widely adopted by the* शास्त्रs *like* व्याकरण, साहित्य, वेदान्त, धर्मशास्त्र etc. Those laws of interpretation which are the best parts of the मीमांसा are, therefore, of permanent value and are worthy of preservation. Particularly, when we take into account the nature of Sanskrit language, as formerly dealt with, we can realize the utility and importance of those principles in the matter of the *scientific and synthetic exposi-*

tion of sentences in language. We have also shown above at different places how those principles, looked at from a new point of view, supply a sound *basis for language teaching;* and in this respect they compare favourably with the Western principles of the study and teaching of language. It has been again shown how the मीमांसा principles of methodology apply in a more or less degree to the science of teaching in general and language-teaching in particular. Other linguistic implications of those principles will again be brought out in detail later on at different places according as there is an occasion for their exposition. Suffice it to say here that in union with the theories of the न्याय about प्रमाण (means of proof) and those of the व्याकरण about पद (a word), those of the मीमांसक about वाक्य (a sentence) give a completely scientific turn to the methods of expounding literature and शास्त्रs.

VII. THE COMPARATIVE METHOD.

Employment of the theories of पद, वाक्य and प्रमाण in the scientific exposition of शास्त्रs and literature necessarily presupposes a comparative study of the व्याकरण, the मीमांसा, and the न्याय, the sciences of general interest and application; and this will vouch for the existence of comparative, critical and scientific

methods in India, although it is denied by the advocates of Western learning. The existence of critical and scientific methods in India has sufficiently been proved in the former parts of this book. Now as regards the 'comparative method' it may be said that 'Correlation of Studies' has always been the educational policy of the Hindus even from ancient times. On account of the enormous expansion of different branches of शास्त्रs ancient students had compulsorily to adopt the course of the 'Participation of Labour' in their studies; and hence with specialization in one or two शास्त्रs they maintained correlation not only with the orthodox but also with the heterodox शास्त्रs. In spite of this specialization in a particular शास्त्र every student learnt at least the fundamentals of general शास्त्रs like the व्याकरण, the मीमांसा and the न्याय; and some students studied the principles of the various schools of thought like the वेदान्त, साङ्ख्य, योग, बौद्ध and जैन philosophies also. The poet बाण (7th century A. D.) in his हर्षचरित makes a direct reference, at the beginning of the third उच्छ्वास, to the study of the Vedas (वेदाभ्यास), sacrificial lore (यज्ञविद्या), exposition of grammar (व्याकरणव्याख्यान), logic (प्रमाण), मीमांसा (पूर्वमीमांसा and वेदान्त) and poetical discusssion (काव्यालाप) as the subjects of the ancient curriculum. Another important reference made by him in the हर्षचरित is to a Buddhist teacher, named दिवाकरमित्र, who in his hermitage encouraged the tendency of comparative studies of different systems of thought

among his students.† Again, ancient works like the तत्त्वसङ्ग्रह of the Buddhist शान्तरक्षित (8th century A. D.), the षड्दर्शनसमुच्चय of the Jain हरिभद्रसूरि (8th century A. D.), and the सर्वदर्शनसङ्ग्रह of the Vaidika माधव or विद्यारण्य (14th century A. D.), which in order to search for Truth present in a nutshell the main tenets of the then existing Indian systems of philosophy, exemplify the tendency of Correlation of Studies among the Hindus and their prominent use of the Comparative Method. Besides, many notable authors of versatile genius, who, after a deep study of various Indian systems, have either written commentaries on them, who have tried to refute systems other than their own, or who have written original works on them, bear testimony to the existence of the Comparative Method in ancient India. Some of those versatile luminaries are शङ्कराचार्य (788 A. D.), वाचस्पतिमिश्र (9th century A. D.), अभिनवगुप्त (10th century A. D.), हेमचन्द्र (11th century A. D.), विद्यारण्य (14th century A. D.), अप्पयदीक्षित (16th century A D.) and नागेश or नागोजिभट्ट (18th century A. D.).

---

† तरुमूलानि निषेवमाणैर्वीतरागैरार्हतैर्मस्करिभिः श्वेतपटैर्भागवतैः कापिलैर्लौकायतिकैः काणादैरौपनिषदैरैश्वरकारणिकैर्धर्मशास्त्रिभिः पौराणिकैः साप्ततन्त्वैः शैवैः शाब्दैः पाञ्चरात्रिकैरन्यैश्च स्वान् स्वान्सिद्धान्ताञ्शृण्वद्भिश्चिन्तयद्भिश्च प्रत्युच्चरद्भिश्च संशयानैश्च निश्चिन्वद्भिश्च व्युत्पादयद्भिश्च विवदमानैश्चाभ्यस्यद्भिश्च शिष्यतां प्रतिपन्नैर्दूरादेवान्वीयमानं...दिवाकरमित्रमद्राक्षीत्।—हर्षचरितम्।

Naturally the Shastris, who study the व्याकरण, the मीमांसा, the न्याय, the वेदान्त, the साहित्य, etc., are fully conversant with all those methods relating to पद, वाक्य and प्रमाण; and the denial of these actual facts is a misrepresentation of truth. We must, *however, be alive to the fact that some Shastris* study only one of those शास्त्रs and resort to narrow specialization, in which there is little scope for the Comparative Method. Yet generally speaking, many Shastris, having recourse to wider specialization, can be found even up to the present day. This wider specialization, which is very desirable according to the modern tendency in education, prompts a student to know everything of a few allied subjects and something of other distantly related ones. It can, therefore, be asserted that this modern tendency was not only prevalent in ancient India, but is still observable in the Shastri methods of teaching the शास्त्रs and literature.

VIII. THE SYNTHETIC METHOD: THE METHODS OF THE वेदान्त.

The most eminent of all the versatile luminaries of ancient India is शङ्कराचार्य, who with a comparative outlook first realized the importance of amalgamating the principles of पद (व्याकरण), वाक्य (पूर्वमीमांसा) and प्रमाण (न्याय) for the exposition of the वेदान्त

philosophy, and who is, therefore, aptly called 'पदवाक्यप्रमाणपारावारपारीण'. He has enriched Sanskrit language with his substantial contribution to the *rational or scientific exposition of the Vedic literature in general and of the Upanishadic philosophy in particular,* and has immensely influenced later authors. It is, therefore, essential to observe the noteworthy features of the methods of explaining the Upanishadic sentences and the worldly phenomena, as employed by him. We have to limit this treatment to the observation of his methodology rather than to a connected and detailed exposition of his philosophical thought, which will, of course, be taken into account incidentally so as to shed light on his methodology. शङ्कराचार्य, doubtless, admits that the principles of पद, वाक्य and प्रमाण are conducive to a systematic and graded exposition of the वेदान्त; yet he never forgets that they are relatively subordinate to the Transcendental Reality and intuitional realization (अनुभव) of the Highest Self (ब्रह्मन्, परमात्मन्) with Whom the Individual Self (जीवात्मन्) is intrinsically identical. He, therefore, saw with penetrating insight that the main purport (तात्पर्य) of the Upanishadic sentences was identity (ऐक्य) or non-duality (अद्वैत) of the Individual Self and the Universal Self. This main purport of non-duality is corroborated by the Upanishads themselves in the four महावाक्यs of the four Vedas, viz., 'प्रज्ञानं ब्रह्म' (Brahman is pure Intelligence), 'अहं ब्रह्मास्मि' (I am Brahman), 'तत्त्वमसि'

(Thou art That) and 'अयमात्मा ब्रह्म' (This Individual Soul is Brahman). In the sentences 'यत्र हि द्वैतमिव भवति' (Where there is, as it were, duality), 'सदेव सोम्येदमग्र आसीदेकमेवाद्वितीयम्' (My dear, this was pure Existence alone in the beginning, one only without a second) the use of the words 'इव' and 'एव' respectively shows that duality is apparent or illusory (मायिक) and emphasizes non-duality as the Ultimate Reality. Sentences like 'द्वितीयाद्वै भयं भवति' (The idea of duality gives rise to fear), 'य उदरमन्तरं कुरुते अथ तस्य भयं भवति' (Fear overcomes him who finds even a slight difference) lead to the same purport. It must be remembered that शङ्कराचार्य owes this *synthetic method* to the सूत्रकार बादरायण, who first systematized the Upanishadic philosophy in his ब्रह्मसूत्रs, and to his great Guru गौडपादाचार्य also, who in his कारिकाs on the माण्डूक्योपनिषद् showed the main outline of Synthesis. The credit, however, of building an edifice of the अद्वैत philosophy on this foundation goes to शङ्कराचार्य.

The task that lay before शङ्कराचार्य was to show *syntactical unity* (एकवाक्यता) *among the apparently contradictory sentences of the Upanishads,* and this he successfully achieved by adopting the seven modes of the मीमांसकs † for the purpose of arriving at the *purport or synthetic meaning* (तात्पर्य) *of the Upanishads.* He, however, asserts against the मीमांसकs that all Upanishadic sentences are directly

† उपक्रम, उपसंहार, अभ्यास, अपूर्वता, फल, अर्थवाद and उपपत्ति. See pp. 123-124.

or indirectly devoted to the exposition of ब्रह्मन् and are in no way subsidiary to Action or Injunction (कर्मशेष, विधिशेष). He further says that the goal of an inquiry into धर्म (duty, action) is the attainment of heaven, which is an imaginary entity from the absolute point of view; while the purpose of an inquiry into ब्रह्मन् is eternal freedom or highest bliss (मोक्ष, निःश्रेयस), which can actually be realized as the intrinsic nature of all. The sentences, therefore, that prescribe Action for attaining an imaginary goal must be subordinated to those propounding ब्रह्मन्, the highest goal, according to the principle of the पूर्वमीमांसा itself, viz., 'फलवत्संनिधावफलं तदङ्गम्' (That which is devoid of any result is to be subordinated to that which has a definite result.). Unlike the मीमांसकs, शङ्कराचार्य holds that not only injunctive (विधिवाक्य) but also assertive sentences (सिद्धवाक्य) like 'तत्त्वमसि' which refer to ब्रह्मन् are meaningful and authoritative. As again the Individual Self (जीव) is superimposed (अध्यस्त) upon the Highest Self through ignorance (अविद्या), his agency (कर्तृत्व) required by the मीमांसकs for the performance of Action is also imaginary. It is then found that शङ्कराचार्य accepts the verbal testimony of the श्रुति or revealed texts of the Upanishads as authoritative in regard to the intuitional knowledge of ब्रह्मन्, where Reasoning (तर्क, युक्ति) is baffled. From another point of view the Upanishads are the inspired utterances of the ancient sages, who had realized the Highest

Reality of परमात्मन्. They are, therefore, very valuable for one who is earnestly proceeding on the path to Self-Realization. Hence शङ्कराचार्य thinks that along with श्रुति the intuition (अनुभव) of the Seers of Truth too is authoritative. He, however, does not discard the Logical Method, which should be followed, according to him, without contradiction to the purport of श्रुति. It may be remarked here that few philosophers in India have resorted to the logical method to the extent to which शङ्कराचार्य has resorted to it. The fact that many sentences in his भाष्यs can be easily transformed into syllogisms testifies to his prominent use of the Logical Method, which he employs while refuting his opponents and convincing them of his conclusions also. Yet he fully recognizes the limitations of the Logical Method or Reasoning in transcendental matters, where श्रुति must be the final authority. Mere reasoning without the help of श्रुति leads us nowhere, since one reasoning is falsified by another, and this process continues *ad infinitum* in the absence of any realization of Truth. He, therefore, concludes that Reasoning, which is supported by श्रुति and helps its interpretation, should be adopted in the वेदान्त. As reasoning is useful only on the empirical plane (व्यावहारिक सत्ता), and as in consonance with श्रुति it gradually leads us to the Absolute State (पारमार्थिक सत्ता), the Logical Method without being opposed to Transcendental Experience subserves it. शङ्कराचार्य thus harmonizes Reasoning (तर्क, युक्ति)

with श्रुति and intuition (अनुभव) of Seers.* It should be remembered that we see through ignorance (अविद्या, माया) the duality of names and forms of the phenomenal world on the substratum (अधिष्ठान) of the non-dual ब्रह्मन्. As the function of all the above प्रमाणs including the श्रुति is to dispel that ignorance and indirectly to lead an aspirant by the maxim of 'शाखाचन्द्र' (the moon on the branch) to the self-luminous ब्रह्मन्, they are relatively authoritative on the empirical plane only. The प्रमाणs cannot directly point out the ब्रह्मन् but suggest its all-pervading presence by means of लक्षणा (Implication). As soon as they dispel ignorance, the self-luminous ब्रह्मन् manifests itself as one Ultimate Reality, and the function and authority of the प्रमाणs are over. Here the false ignorance is removed by the प्रमाणs which are false from the Absolute point of view, and then ब्रह्मन् is realized as ever-present. For, the removal of darkness is itself the attainment of light. Maintaining this position about the प्रमाणs शङ्कराचार्य makes use

---

* वाक्यार्थविचारणाध्यवसाननिर्वृत्ता हि ब्रह्मावगतिर्नानुमानादिप्रमाणान्तरनिर्वृत्ता । सत्सु तु वेदान्तवाक्येषु जगतो जन्मादिकारणवादिषु तदर्थग्रहणदार्ढ्यायानुमानमपि वेदान्तवाक्याविरोधि प्रमाणं भवन्न निवार्यते, श्रुत्यैव च सहायत्वेन तर्कस्याभ्युपेतत्वात् ।...न धर्मजिज्ञासायामिव श्रुत्यादय एव प्रमाणं ब्रह्मजिज्ञासायां, किन्तु श्रुत्यादयोऽनुभवादयश्च यथासम्भवमिह प्रमाणम्, अनुभवावसानत्वाद् भूतवस्तुविषयत्वाच्च ब्रह्मज्ञानस्य ।

—ब्र. सू. भाष्यम्, १'१'२.

of the व्याकरण (पद) for deriving words like 'ब्रह्मन्' from the root बृह् (to be great) or for explaining compounds and the कारक relation, of the मीमांसा (वाक्य) for showing the unanimity of sentences relating to ब्रह्मन्, and of the न्याय (प्रमाण) for refuting the fallacious arguments of his opponents and constructing a rational and graded system of Adwaita philosophy. This is how he establishes a *higher synthesis* of the divergent शास्त्रs and of the phenomena of the universe.

In addition to the Upanishadic sentences relating to the Ultimate Reality of ब्रह्मन् there are other Upanishadic sentences referring to कर्मन् (Action), उपासना (meditation, devotion) and the creation of the universe. Although they seem to be opposed to ज्ञान (supreme knowledge), they are, according to the main purport of the Upanishads, to be construed as subsidiaries or means to ज्ञान, which is the main goal. Thus कर्मन्, उपासना and योग, mentioned in the Upanishads are, according to शङ्कराचार्य, designed for the purification and concentration of the mind, in which then the self-luminous ज्ञान dawns. All activities, all sciences, all ethics of the धर्म, all diversity of कर्मन्, उपासना, etc., must, therfore, be graded in such a way that all of them should culminate in the unity of ज्ञान. Thus कर्मन्, उपासना and ज्ञान have been so harmonized by शङ्कराचार्य, that a person desiring Liberation should be led step by step to the Ultimate Reality. शङ्कराचार्य here takes into account the important distinction of परा विद्या (Higher Knowledge)

and अपरा विद्या (Lower Knowledge) made by the Upanishads themselves (मुण्डक १–१–४) and postulates correspondingly the पर or निर्गुण (Higher or unqualified) ब्रह्मन् and अपर or सगुण (Lower or qualified) ब्रह्मन् according to the purport or synthetic meaning of the Upanishads. He further means that the अपराविद्या which propounds meditation etc , of the अपरब्रह्मन् is a means to the पराविद्या relating to the परब्रह्मन्, as it is found in other spheres too that the description or illustration of concrete things facilitates the understanding of abstract thoughts in the case of ordinary people. He, therefore, purports that the अपराविद्या and अपरब्रह्मन् which are concrete by nature are useful for ordinary people on the empirical plane (व्यावहारिक सत्ता) in leading them gradually to पराविद्या and परब्रह्मन्. Thus शङ्कराचार्य, the great teacher, postulates two grades of knowledge in the teaching of non-duality so as to suit the capacities or qualifications (अधिकार) of aspirants of different grades. He, therefore, makes provision in his comprehensive system for all grades of people, ignorant as well as intelligent and seekers (साधक) as well as seers (सिद्ध) of Ultimate Truth, and hence the popularity of that system in India. Moreover, the system of शङ्कराचार्य gives scope for adaptability to changing circumstances on the phenomenal plane (व्यावहारिक सत्ता) without in any way modifying the fundamental principle of non-duality, which is the eternal substratum of all changing names and forms of the

world. Again, instead of being opposed to the modern scientific inventions, which contribute to the worldly prosperity (अभ्युदय), शङ्कराचार्य's system affords full scope for them on the phenomenal plane, if they do not lead us astray to the destruction of humanity through exploitation and aggression, and if they do not delude us as to the main human goal, which is the Realization of the Self (निःश्रेयस). On the other hand, every such invention, past or future, is a new addition of names and forms (नामरूप) to the former ones, and demonstrates the truth that all this diversity emanates from Unity, which is defined by the वेदान्त as 'the intelligent cause of this universe.'

As said above, the Upanishads contain descriptions of the creation and dissolution of the universe, and it is stated in them that ब्रह्मन् is the intelligent cause of the creation, sustenance and dissolution of the universe in Itself. The sentences 'यतो वा इमानि भूतानि जायन्ते०' (तैत्ति० ३।१)–'From whom these beings are born, etc.', 'सर्वकर्मा सर्वकामः सर्वगन्धः सर्वरसः' (छां० ३।१४।२)–'From whom all actions' desires, smells and flavours emanate,' etc., give us an idea of the relative or qualified (अपर, सगुण) ब्रह्मन्. On the other hand, there are Upanishadic sentences which merely indicate the true nature of ब्रह्मन्, as, 'सत्यं ज्ञानमनन्तं ब्रह्म' (तै० २।१)–'ब्रह्मन् is pure Existence, Intelligence and Infinity,' or those which negate all attributes of ब्रह्मन्, as, 'अशब्दमस्पर्शमरूपमव्ययम्' (कठ.३।१५)–'Which is without sound, touch, form and

decay'. These latter sentences in the Upanishads tell that there is no relativity in ब्रह्मन्, but that ब्रह्मन् is Absolute or unqualified. शङ्कराचार्य, on the basis of such sentences and of the ब्रह्मसूत्रs (३।२।११–२१), says from the synthetic point of view that the श्रुति makes *this distinction* simply for the sake of leading an aspirant from the first to the second by gradual stages, and does not mean that the सगुणब्रह्मन् is the ultimate reality.* The harmony between such two sets of श्रुति can be established by the hypothesis of Nescience or माया. That is to say, the निर्गुण ब्रह्मन् becomes सगुण ब्रह्मन् or ईश्वर on account of the limiting adjunct (उपाधि) of Nescience or माया, which is the incomprehensible power of ब्रह्मन् Itself, and which, without really being an entity separate from ब्रह्मन्, is supposed to be different from it. This *Nescience, illuminated by the self-luminous* ब्रह्मन्, shows us the imaginary world of names and forms. In other words, ब्रह्मन् being associated with the limiting adjunct of Nescience is said to be the cause of the creation of the world, just as the rope associated with the ignorance relating to it is said to create the imaginary snake on it. Thus the world is falsely created, sustained and dissolved by the सगुण ब्रह्मन् or ईश्वर in Himself, just as the snake is

---

* भेदस्योपासनार्थत्वादभेदे तात्पर्यात् । (ब्र. सू. भा. ३।२।१२) तस्मादेवंजातीयकेषु वाक्येषु यथाश्रुतं निराकारमेव ब्रह्मावधारयितव्यम् । इतराणि त्वाकारवद्ब्रह्मविषयाणि वाक्यानि न तत्प्रधानानि । उपासनाविधिप्रधानानि हि तानि । ब्र. सू. भा. ३।२।१४.

falsely created, sustained and dissolved in itself by the rope. As then the creation, sustenance and dissolution of the world are merely a false appearance or magic transformation (विवर्त) on the substratum of ब्रह्मन्, the causality of ब्रह्मन् and Its name 'ईश्वर', 'सगुण', etc., are relatively true as long as the worldly phenomena appear, and not Its true nature. Its true nature is, therefore, 'सत्यं ज्ञानमनन्तं ब्रह्म' or that which negates all attributes. The definition, wherein ब्रह्मन् is relatively described as the imaginary cause of the world, is called 'तटस्थ-लक्षण', and the definition, wherein Its true nature is indicated, is called 'स्वरूपलक्षण'.

As ब्रह्मन्, through the agency of माया, becomes the imaginary cause of creation, so it is also the cause of the dissolution of the world in Itself. It is, therefore, both the efficient cause (निमित्तकारण) and the material cause (उपादानकारण) of the universe, just like the spider sending forth and drawing in its threads.† Since ब्रह्मन् appears to be the world to ignorant people by magic transformation (विवर्त) and not by actual transformation (परिणाम), the view of शङ्कराचार्य about causation is different from the परिणामवाद of the साङ्ख्यs, who accept the non-intelligent Primeval Matter (प्रकृति) as the cause and the intelligent पुरुष as different from it. The theory of विवर्त differs also from the आरम्भवाद of the न्यायवैशेषिकs, who accept God as only the efficient cause and the infinitesimal

† यथोर्णनाभिः सृजते गृह्णते च ।–मुं. १·१·७.

atoms, which are different from God, as the material cause. Now if it is supposed that actual transformation (परिणाम) of ब्रह्मन् takes place, the immutability of the Intelligent ब्रह्मन् described by the श्रुति would be falsified, and none would seek to attain It as the eternal Bliss of the Self.

It is noteworthy that the Causal Relation postulated in every science other than the वेदान्त is based upon the distinction of cause and effect. The cause is defined as 'an invariable, unconditional and immediate antecedent of a phenomenon.' But there the 'invariability' etc. of the cause, without being actually and definitely perceived, rests on our belief in 'probability'; and even a single fact coming forth as contradictory to that probability frustrates that causation. There is, really speaking, no line of demarcation where the causal state ceases and where the effect begins to appear. In most cases the cause is never directly tangible but is only inferred from the effect. Hence, even though for the convenience of worldly affairs we take the cause to be different from the effect, yet the cause and the effect in their *true essence* are not different. They are merely names and forms attributed to the same *eternal essence.* The worldly phenomenon is then a beginningless flux of 'names and forms' where the antecedence of the cause and the sequence of the effect cannot be settled; and the change that appears to take place and that makes us employ the words 'cause and effect' is not at all a change in the inner essence, which is the eternal Existence;

Intelligence and Infinity (सत्यं ज्ञानमनन्तम्), but is a change only in names and forms imagined by our mind. This is the reason why शङ्कराचार्य adopts the अनिर्वचनीयख्याति (Theory of inexplicability) or the विवर्तवाद (Theory of illusory transformation) in order to account for the phenomena of the universe; and he accepts the causality of ब्रह्मन् through 'विवर्त' and that of माया associated with It through परिणाम. It is here interesting to note that the modern scientists cannot definitely explain the relation between electrons and protons, and are gradually being led to rest on 'अनिर्वचनीयता' (inexplicability). It may, therefore, be said that they are ceasing to be Materialists, that the causal relation of things, experimental work, scientific method, induction, etc., are relatively true from the phenomenal standpoint, and that all theories attempting to explain the phenomena of the universe are provisional or relative,-true in the व्यावहारिक सत्ता only. Time and space which are the basis of the causal relation and several provisional theories are merely the subjective musings of the mind. Although the विवर्तवाद, postulated by शङ्कराचार्य for explaining the creation and dissolution of the world, as described in the Upanishads, is such a provisional theory, *it serves best its purpose of leading the aspirant to the Ultimate Reality of the Absolute.* According to this theory the effect is not different from the cause; and hence the world of names and forms which falsely appears in manifold ways upon the unaffected ब्रह्मन्, its sub-

stratum, is not different from ब्रह्मन्, just as the snake on the rope is not different from the rope, or the dream-world is not different from the dreaming person.

The world is then an illusion, not in the sense that it is the void (शून्य) or non-entity of the Buddhists, but in the sense that it has no existence independently of ब्रह्मन्, which is Existence, Intelligence and Infinity. It should be particularly noted that शङ्कराचार्य does not deny the reality of the world on the phenomenal plane. What he means is that the world is relatively real as long as our senses and mind operate, or as long as the cosmic ignorance (समष्टि अज्ञान = माया), which gives rise to it is not removed by the superconsciousness of Absolute Reality, just as a dream is real as long as we have not attained wakefulness. As in the case of the snake appearing on the rope we cannot say whether it exists or does not exist, so in the case of the world too we cannot say whether it exists or does not exist. Since the world is neither existent nor non-existent (सदसद्विलक्षण), we have to conclude that it is inexplicable (अनिर्वचनीय). The existence or reality of the world does not belong to itself, but belongs to ब्रह्मन्, just as the reality of the snake does not belong to itself but belongs to the rope. This is what शङ्कराचार्य means by the words 'माया' and 'मिथ्या' which do not mean 'शून्य' (void, nothing). It must be remembered that an illusory phenomenon appears only on *a positive basis* and not on a

negative non-entity. So the illusory world appears to be real (relatively) on the substratum of the ever-existent ब्रह्मन्. Again, as the relation between the world and ब्रह्मन् cannot be explained either by संयोग (conjunction) or by समवाय (inherence), it has to be concluded that it is due to the Superimposition (अध्यास) caused by Nescience.

It should not be supposed that the theory of माया and that of Superimposition (अध्यास) arising from it are शङ्कराचार्य's own fabrications. For references to माया, express,$ implied† or through the use of the word 'अविद्या'§ can be found in the Upanishads as well as in the ब्रह्मसूत्रs. In the ऋग्वेद the word 'माया' is used in the sense of 'a wondrous or supernatural power', and in the नासदीयसूक्त (ऋ. X. 129) the idea of 'अनिर्वचनीयता' (inexplicability) is found embedded. In the अथर्ववेद the word 'माया' is used in the sense of 'magic,' which further develops into the sense of 'illusion'. गौडपादाचार्य, the great Guru of शङ्कराचार्य makes repeated references to 'माया' in the sense of 'illusion' in his माण्डूक्यकारिका. What शङ्कराचार्य did was that on the basis of these data he *synthesized the idea of* माया *and gave a systematic exposition of it.*

$ बृह० २।५।१९; प्रश्न० १।१६; श्वेता. १।१० and ४।९–१०; ब्रह्मसूत्र ३।२।३.

† बृ० २।४।१४, ३।४।२, ४।८।१९; छां० ६।१।४, ७।२४।१, ८।३।१–३; कठ० ४।१०; ब्र० सू० २।१।१४, २।१।२८.

§ बृ० ४।४।४; कठ० २।४–५; मुं० १।२।८, २।१।१०; छां० १।१।१०.

This idea can also be corroborated by quoting the empirical experience of every being. Just as every human being says 'I know', so he also says 'I do not know' (अहमज्ञ:, न किञ्चिद्वेदिषम्). This empirical experience of 'knowing' is the indication of the fact that every being is of the nature of pure Intelligence or Knowledge (चित्स्वरूप); while the experience of 'not knowing', which is somehow associated with 'knowing', and which is *really illuminated by pure Intelligence,* is the indication of the fact that he is possessed of innate Ignorance. This Ignorance looked at from the individual (व्यष्टि) point of view is called 'अविद्या' and from the collective (समष्टि) point of view it is called 'माया' or Cosmic Ignorance. This Ignorance or Nescience makes us superimpose the body, the mind, etc., upon our inward Intelligence and designate it as 'the individual, the knower or the subject' (जीव, प्रमाता, विषयी). It again makes us superimpose the whole world of names and forms on the external all-pervading Intelligence and call it 'the universe, the known or the object' (जगत्, प्रमेय, विषय).' Further the subject and his attributes are superimposed on the object and its attributes, or the object on the subject; and thus the Real and the Unreal are coupled together through this inherent Ignorance. The fact, however, is that the pure Intelligence (संविद्), internal and external, or individual and universal, is Unity without a gap. For, no means of knowledge (प्रमाण) can connect itself with the knower (प्रमाता) and the

known (प्रमेय) unless all are *essentially one*, though they appear to be different from one another on account of illusory limiting adjuncts (उपाधि). Really speaking, the same eternal Intelligence (चित्, संविद्) is, as it were, divided into three modes, viz., प्रमाता, प्रमाण and प्रमेय by the process of Superimposition (अध्यास). This superimposition is defined by शङ्कराचार्य as, "the false perception, in the form of recollection, of a thing previously seen, in another thing",* or "the supposition of a thing in another thing where it does not exist." † While giving this definition of Superimposition शङ्कराचार्य quotes, on the same, the views of other systems of philosophy, viz., the अन्यथाख्यातिवादिन्s or नैयायिकs and भाट्टमीमांसकs, the आत्मख्यातिवादिन्s or विज्ञानवादी बौद्धs, the अख्यातिवादिन्s or प्राभाकरमीमांसकs and the असत्ख्यातिवादिन्s or शून्यवादी बौद्धs. It will be particularly noted that शङ्कराचार्य here finds with a *comparative and synthetic outlook* the common feature of all those views, and says that all these systems agree in respect of holding Superimposition to be the assumption of the attributes of one thing in another thing. § He himself resorts, however, to the विवर्तवाद or अनिर्वचनीयख्याति, which is so called because we cannot explain *how* this phenomenon takes place.

---

* आह—कोऽयमध्यासो नामेति । उच्यते—स्मृतिरूपः परत्र पूर्वदृष्टावभासः । (अध्यासभाष्य).

† अध्यासो नाम अतस्मिंस्तद्बुद्धिः । (अ. भा.).

§ सर्वथापि त्वन्यस्यान्यधर्मावभासतां न व्यभिचरति । (अ. भा.)

It will be noted that शङ्कराचार्य adopts the विवर्तवाद according to the maxim of 'अध्यारोपापवाद' $ or the method of assumption and negation. The world is first assumed to exist and then negated, as the snake is assumed to exist on the rope and then negated. Strictly speaking, this विवर्तवाद naturally culminates in the अजातिवाद of गौडपादाचार्य. For, false creation or dissolution of the world is equivalent to no creation or dissolution, as the false assumption or negation of the snake on the rope means that the snake is never born or destroyed. The Nescience, the विवर्त or अध्यास resulting from Nescience, and the duality of the world are, however, postulated, like the hypothesis in geometry, according to the ordinary experience or crude understanding of ignorant pupils, simply for the purpose of gradually leading them to the Highest Unity of परमात्मन्. This method of teaching is strictly in accordance with the कारिकाs of गौडपाद, who purports that the assumed duality of the teacher, the taught and the शास्त्र is simply for the purpose of 'instruction', and that it disappears when the Highest Reality is known. § Again, गौडपाद says that the separateness of the Individual Soul and the Universal Soul is only secondary and not primary; for, it is assumed after

---

$ Read the following verse– " इत्युक्त्वाभिमुखीकृत्य शिष्यं करुणया गुरुः। अध्यारोपापवादाभ्यां निष्प्रपञ्चं प्रपञ्चयन् ॥२९५॥

(सर्ववेदान्तसिद्धान्तसारसङ्ग्रहः)

§ उपदेशादयं वादो ज्ञाते द्वैतं न विद्यते। माण्डूक्यकारिका, १।१८.

keeping in view their would-be identity (भविष्यद्वृत्ति), which is the main purport.† The Upanishadic sentences describing the creation of the world are, according to गौडपाद, meant for the purpose of explaining the identity of the Individual Soul and the Universal Soul. Really there is no duality of any kind.* It is said about the विवर्तवाद as follows—

बालान् प्रति विवर्तोऽयं ब्रह्मणः सकलं जगत् ।
अविवर्तितमानन्दमास्थिताः कृतिनः सदा ॥
(Quoted in the अद्वैतब्रह्मसिद्धि)

"The theory that the world is an illusory transformation of ब्रह्मन् is resorted to simply for the clear understanding of beginners. The blessed, i. e., the knowers of ब्रह्मन् are always full of Unlimited Bliss devoid of illusion."

विद्यारण्य too says that the language based on duality may be used for the expression and removal of a doubt.§ With the same view of facilitating the understanding of novices the later वेदान्तिन्s $ of the अद्वैत system have devised the अवच्छेदवाद (Theory of Limitation), the आभासवाद (Theory of Resemblance),

---

† (जीवात्मनोः पृथक्त्वं) भविष्यद्वृत्त्या गौणं तन्मुख्यत्वं न हि युज्यते ।
मां. का., ३।१४.

* "...सृष्टिर्या चोदिताऽन्यथा । उपायः सोऽवताराय नास्ति भेदः कथञ्चन ॥–मां. का. ३।१५.

§ चोद्यं वा परिहारो वा क्रियतां द्वैतभाषया । पञ्चदशी–२।२९.

$ वाचस्पतेरवच्छेद आभासो वार्तिकस्य च ।
सङ्क्षेपशारीरकृतां प्रतिबिम्बमिहेष्यते ॥ (सिद्धान्तबिन्दु)

and the प्रतिबिम्बवाद (Theory of Reflection), all of which are the corollaries of the विवर्तवाद. All these are the *different Methods of Exposition* (प्रक्रिया), which through easy illustrations aim at carrying the aspirant to the Highest Goal. For, it is said by the वार्तिककार—

यया यया भवेत्पुंसो व्युत्पत्तिः प्रत्यगात्मनि।
सा सैव प्रक्रिया ज्ञेया साध्वी सा चानवस्थिता॥

—(Quoted in the सिद्धान्तबिन्दु)

"That method should be known to be a good one, which would help a man to have a clear grasp of the Inner Self, even though it might be provisional."

Thus the विवर्तवाद, which gives rise to the above methods, is a *comprehensive method* provisionally adopted by शङ्कराचार्य in order to solve the riddle of the universe and to include people of all the three grades in his system. The first grade is the व्यावहारिक सत्ता (Empirical or Phenomenal Plane) of ordinary people, who believe in the phenomenal reality and duality of the world; and this plane corresponds to the wakeful state (जाग्रत्), in which all beings see this world and deal with it. The second grade is the प्रातिभासिक सत्ता (Illusory Plane) of those who have understood the illusory nature of the world and see it just like a dream (स्वप्न). The third grade or the पारमार्थिक सत्ता (State of Absolute Reality) is the highest stage of the Realization of the Self, in which there is no cognition of

separate entity (i. e. the world), and in which there is the Absolute Rest of परमात्मन्, as it is in deep sleep (सुषुप्ति). These three grades have been postulated by शङ्कराचार्य in order that the aspirant should reach the highest goal through graded steps. In the अद्वैतवेदान्त the दृष्टिसृष्टिवाद (Absolute or Pure Idealism) is the foremost theory, which propounds that the universe is not apart from the sight (Intelligence) of the Seer, or that it is pure Intelligence (संविद्), and which is, therefore, meant for the advanced people of the प्रातिभासिक and पारमार्थिक states. The main point to be noted here is that *extraordinary synthetic power, logical acumen and wider outlook* have been exhibited by शङ्कराचार्य in propounding the विवर्तवाद and in giving an *analytico-synthetic interpretation of the Upanishads.**

* "The task of reducing the teaching of the whole of the Upanishads to a system consistent and free from contradictions is an intrinsically impossible one. But the task once being given, we are quite ready to admit that Sankara's system is most probably the best which can be devised...We yet acknowledge that the adoption of that distinction (of a lower and higher Brahman) furnishes the interpreter with an instrument of extraordinary power for reducing to an orderly whole the heterogeneous material presented by the old theosophic treatises...Sankara's method thus enables him in a certain way to do justice to different stages of historical development, to recognise clearly existing differences which other systematisers are intent on obliterating...It (Sankara's system) is not only more pliable, more capable of amalgamating heterogeneous material

It has been shown above that the व्यावहारिक सत्ता, प्रातिभासिक सत्ता and पारमार्थिक सत्ता broadly correspond to the three states of the Individual Soul, viz., जाग्रत्, स्वप्न and सुषुप्ति. All human activities, physical as well as intellectual, ordinary as well as scientific, proceed only in the consciousness of जाग्रत्; and the reality of the phenomenal world is perceived only in the जाग्रत्. But to lay undue stress on this जाग्रत् and to call the world 'real' from the stand-point of जाग्रत् is only a partial appoach to Truth, which is, therefore, bound to remain 'relative.' Unless the experiences of all those three states are *analysed*, and unless the unbroken (अखण्ड) presence of One Seer or Witness (साक्षिन्) of the three states is *synthetically* realized, there can be no complete approach to the Absolute Truth. Every one of those three states being evanescent is annulled by the other, so that when one state is present, the other is absent; while the साक्षिन्, who illumines and unifies all their conscious as well as unconscious experiences and yet remains untouched by them, is one and the same. The assumption of the existence of those three states, therefore, involves अध्यारोप, and the negation of them so as to approach the ever-present साक्षिन् involves अपवाद. In other words, the

---

than other systems, but its fundamental doctrines are manifestly in greater harmony with the essential teaching of the Upanishads than those of other Vedantic systems.

—G. Thibaut–Introduction to the Vedanta-Sutras, pp. CXXII–CXXIV.

examination of all the three states and their negation is the process of *Analysis*, while the realization of one साक्षिन् everywhere is the process of *Synthesis*. The whole method here employed may then be called the *Analytico-Synthetic Method*, which being throughly scientific deserves to be employed as the complete method even by the modern mental sciences in their search for Truth. Although this method is called 'अन्वयव्यतिरेक' in the वेदान्त system, it somewhat differs from the 'अन्वयव्यतिरेक' of the नैयायिकs, as the latter is applied only to the experiences of the जाग्रत्-state and takes the world to be a real entity. The 'अन्वयव्यतिरेक' method of the वेदान्त, on the other hand, is applied not only to जाग्रत् but to स्वप्न and सुषुप्ति also, for demonstrating their reciprocal absence and negation (व्यतिरेक) and for realizing the all-pervading presence(अन्वय) of साक्षिन्. As then this method of अन्वयव्यतिरेक is applied to the *whole human experience*, conscious as well as unconscious, its employment for the examination of the three states (जाग्रत्स्वप्नसुषुप्ति) and realization of साक्षिन् is *the fundamental topic of the* वेदान्त *philosophy*.

This most important topic has received very subtle exposition in several Upanishands,† the माण्डूक्यकारिकाs and the भाष्यs of शङ्कराचार्य. The method of अन्वय (Inclusion, Synthesis) is employed by the

† कठ. ४।४; छान्दोग्य ६।८–११; बृह. २।१।१५–२०, २।५।१-१५, ४।२।३, ४।३।१–३८; कौषीतकि. ३।३.

Upanishads in affirmative sentences like 'सर्वं खल्विदं ब्रह्म' (छां. ३।१४।१)-(All this is Brahman), or in those that describe the all-pervading presence of ब्रह्मन् in all names and forms (बृ. २।४।६-११); while the method of व्यतिरेक (Exclusion, Negation, Analysis) is used in negative sentences like 'नेह नानास्ति किञ्चन' (बृ. ४।४।१९)-[There is no duality of any sort here], 'नेति नेति' (बृ. २।३।६)-[Not this, not this], 'अन्यदेव तद्विदितादथो अविदितादधि' (केन. १।३)-[It is distinct from the known and above the unknown], 'यतो वाचो निवर्तन्ते अप्राप्य मनसा सह' (तै. २।४।१)-[From Whom words and the mind turn away without reaching Him], etc.

उद्दालक आरुणि in his advice to श्वेतकेतु (छां. ६।८-११) repeats the महावाक्य 'तत्त्वमसि' [Thou (जीव) art That (ईश्वर)] several times after quoting various familiar illustrations. It is worthy of note that he cites the experiences of deep sleep, dream and wakefulness in order to expound the identity of जीव and ईश्वर. In the अद्वैतवेदान्त 'ईश्वर' technically means Existence (सत्), Intelligence (चित्), and Bliss (आनन्द), the Self of all creatures, when It is associated with the limiting adjunct (उपाधि) of cosmic ignorance (समष्टि अज्ञान-माया) in deep sleep or before the creation of the world. In deep sleep all creatures (जीव) setting aside their Individuality are really united with 'सत्', their own Self. Although this 'सत्' or Intelligent Seer illumines the collective ignorance (समष्टि अज्ञान) of all creatures, He, being as it were limited by that ignorance, is called 'ईश्वर'. On

the other hand, Individuality (जीवत्व) is distinctly felt by all creatures in wakefulness, which too is *illumined individually by the same Intelligent Seer*, who is then, as it were, limited by the individual ignorance of every creature and is called 'जीव'. As every जीव of the wakeful state can recollect the identical experience of the 'ईश्वर' of deep sleep in the form of a sentence like 'I slept very happily, I then knew nothing' (सुखमहमस्वाप्सं, न किञ्चिदवेदिषम्), he must be identical with ईश्वर, since one who *experiences* and one who *recollects* that experience are bound to be *identical*. The identity of जीव and ईश्वर is established by the following methods :

First, the limiting adjuncts of जीव and ईश्वर (i. e. व्यष्टि अज्ञान, समष्टि अज्ञान, etc.) are eliminated by the method of negation (व्यतिरेक) or जहल्लक्षणा (Exclusive Implication) which is then supplemented by the method of अन्वय (synthesis) or अजहल्लक्षणा (Inclusive Implication) enabling us to realize the *inner presence of the common underlying Intelligence*. Thus it will be seen that the combination of व्यतिरेक and अन्वय or the analytico-synthetic method leads us to the *unifying Inner Self* of us all. In the Upanishads, in the भाष्यs of शङ्कराचार्य and in later Sanskrit works, however, *a major portion is occupied by the व्यतिरेक method rather than by the अन्वय method*. This is quite in accordance with the crude understanding of ignorant people, who are not expected to realize the full significance of

अन्वय, unless their Nescience is completely dispelled by the repeated employment of the व्यतिरेक method.

व्यतिरेक or *negation* of the world is then the negation of apparent names and forms only and *not of the Inner Essence.* Use of Logic too is made in this method of व्यतिरेक for analysing the empirical experiences of the three states. But this logical analysis, though it places the वेदान्त system on a rational basis, is always supplemented by the authority of श्रुति. This logical analysis can do its utmost only in the elimination of duality. For, *the self-luminous Inner Self, the substratum of all duality, cannot further be analysed or negated.* The Upanishad says, "येनेदं विजानाति तं केन विजानीयात्। विज्ञातारमरे केन विजानीयात्" (बृ. ४।५।१५)–[Through what should one know Him by Whom one knows all this? Through what should one know the Knower?]. This Knower (विज्ञाता) is the Self who inspires us to establish the synthesis(अन्वय) of all. It need not here be supposed that when every name and form of the world is negated, what remains is only 'the void or nothing' (शून्य) of the Buddhists. For, that '*void or nothing*' *cannot be thought of unless it is illumined by the Eternal Seer* who is not non-existent even in the absence of words. *

* In connection with the method of अन्वयव्यतिरेक the following verses from the पञ्चदशी of विद्यारण्य may be read:– अन्वयव्यतिरेकाभ्यां पञ्चकोशविवेकतः। स्वात्मानं तत उद्धृत्य परं ब्रह्म प्रपद्यते ॥ १।३७ ॥ पञ्चकोशपरित्यागे साक्षिबोधावशेषतः। स्वस्वरूपं स:

This indescribable Eternal Seer, from the stand-point of अन्वय, reveals Himself in the form of time, space, science, art, literature, religion, etc.; and the knowledge of this Seer can establish *the higher synthesis of all dualistic systems of thought,* even though they are in conflict with one another. गौडपादाचार्य significantly says—

परस्परं विरुध्यन्ते तैरयं न विरुध्यते ।

माण्डूक्यकारिका, ३।१७.

" The dualists oppose one another; the Adwaitin, however, does not conflict with them. "

In the भाष्य on this कारिका, शङ्कराचार्य eloquently and nobly says: " Our system, which establishes the unity of आत्मन् and which is based upon the श्रुति, does not conflict with those mutually conflicting systems, on account of our inner identity with them all, just as one cannot conflict with one's own hands and feet. " † This is why शङ्कराचार्य accepts good points from all Indian systems and assigns to them a proper place in the wider scheme of his *analytico-synthetic meth d ology.*

एव स्याच्छून्यत्वं तस्य दुर्घटम् ॥ ३।२२ ॥ अत एव श्रुतिर्बाध्यं बाधित्वा शेषयत्यदः । स एष नेति नेत्यात्मेत्यतद्व्यावृत्तिरूपतः ॥ ३।३२ ॥ अतद्व्यावृत्तिरूपेण साक्षाद्विधिमुखेन च । वेदान्तानां प्रवृत्तिः स्याद् द्विधेत्याचार्यभाषितम् ॥ ७।८७ ॥ विविञ्चता भोक्तृतत्त्वं जाग्रदादिष्वसङ्गता । अन्वयव्यतिरेकाभ्यां साक्षिण्यध्यवसीयते ॥ ७।२१० ॥

† तैरन्योन्यविरोधिभिरस्मदीयोऽयं वैदिकः सर्वानन्यत्वादात्मैकत्वदर्शनपक्षो न विरुध्यते, यथा स्वहस्तपादादिभिः । माण्डूक्यभाष्य, ३।१७.

Thus शङ्कराचार्य accepts the *grammatical method* of dealing with words (पद), though he refutes the स्फोट of the वैयाकरणs; he adopts the मीमांसा-principles of interpreting Vedic sentences (वाक्य), though he refutes the कर्मवाद of the मीमांसकs and subordinates कर्म to ज्ञान; he sanctions in general the methodology of the न्यायवैशेषिकs and their *theory of* प्रमाणs, though he rejects their आरम्भवाद and ईश्वर as the efficient cause only; he amalgamates the whole *psychology of the* साङ्ख्ययोग *system* with the Adwaita philosophy, though he shatters to pieces the प्रधानकारणवाद of the निरीश्वरसाङ्ख्यs and the two entities, प्रधान and ईश्वर, propounded by the सेश्वरसाङ्ख्यs (योगिन्s)$; and he seems to lend support to the ethics of the बौद्धs and जैनs, though as regards the authority of the Veda and the Ultimate Reality of the universe he refutes their views. § Since शङ्कराचार्य sees all the followers of those systems as intrinsically *one* with his own Self, he does not regard them as his real opponents. He refutes all of them because the knowledge they deal with and the theories they propound fall only *within the province of* जाग्रत्, which is actuated by the primal Nescience. They do not, therefore, lead human beings to their own real nature (ब्रह्मन्) as aimed at

---

$ तेनेष्टमेव साङ्ख्ययोगस्मृत्योः सावकाशत्वम्। (ब्र. सू. भा. २।१।३).

§ The refutations of all these systems are mostly included in the First अध्याय and the first two पादs of the Second अध्याय in the ब्रह्मसूत्रभाष्य.

by the benevolent श्रुति. If it is said that even the वेदान्त philosophy and the विवर्तवाद or other theories put forth in it belong to the province of जाग्रत् actuated by the primal Nescience, शङ्कराचार्य's ready reply is that the case of the वेदान्त philosophy too is really such. In other words, it is true that the विवर्तवाद and other theories of the वेदान्त are really provisional. He, however, makes one difference here that the other शास्त्रs lead us astray from the Ultimate Reality of ब्रह्मन्, while the वेदान्तशास्त्र which, with its theories like the विवर्तवाद, is based upon the superconscious intuition (अनुभव) of the Seers of ब्रह्मन्, and upon the श्रुति indicating that intuition, is worthy of being studied for the attainment of one's own Highest Bliss.† The other शास्त्रs keep us confined to the primal Nescience, while the वेदान्तशास्त्र, though it belongs to the sphere of Nescience, treats of the self-luminous ब्रह्मन् and dispels that Nescience, just as a mere negative word, and not an actual staff, can kill the imaginary snake on the rope, or a weapon belonging to the dream-world alone can kill a lion seen in a dream. After fully taking into account this relative nature of the वेदान्तशास्त्र, शङ्कराचार्य has purposely

† तमेतमेवंलक्षणमध्यासं पण्डिता 'अविद्या' इति मन्यन्ते, तद्विवेकेन च वस्तुस्वरूपावधारणं विद्यामाहुः। ... तमेतमविद्याख्यमात्मानात्मनोरितरेतराध्यासं पुरस्कृत्य सर्वे प्रमाणप्रमेयव्यवहारा लौकिकाः प्रवृत्ताः, सर्वाणि च शास्त्राणि विधिप्रतिषेधमोक्षपराणि। ... अस्यानर्थहेतोः प्रहाणाय आत्मैकत्वविद्याप्रतिपत्तये सर्वे वेदान्ता आरभ्यन्ते। —अध्यासभाष्य।

adopted the विवर्तवाद, and has written all his भाष्यs, particularly the ब्रह्मसूत्रभाष्य, by interpreting the main purport of the श्रुति in the light of this विवर्तवाद as well as with due attention to the व्यावहारिक सत्ता, which is *suited to the understanding of ordinary people*, and which is, therefore, a plane fit for the instruction of ब्रह्मन्.

शङ्कराचार्य's attitude in regard to the refutation of other systems is as explained above. His usual method of refutation is first to present step by step the पूर्वपक्षs of other systems so faithfully and completely that the reader should be led to regard the पूर्वपक्ष itself as the conclusive view (सिद्धान्त), which is always quite convincing and not refutable. In such a presentation of the पूर्वपक्ष he anticipates all possible objections that may be raised by the opponent, and gives sufficient testimony to his deep *comparative study* of all those systems. After the presentation of the पूर्वपक्ष in this way, he gradually begins to expose flaws and contradictions in the arguments of the opponent with subtlety, extraordinary power of argumentation and logical acumen. In his own counter-arguments he employs all logical means of proof (प्रमाण) and plays the role of a skilful lawyer whose main aim is merely to beat the other party hollow without giving any clue to his own conclusive view. In such cases the tenets of the Adwaita philosophy occur only incidentally and can be collected or organized into a constructive philosophy with some

effort. Although refutation is sometimes his main aim, his language never smacks of derision or hatred, and even in the heat of argument he rarely uses cutting words. An important fact to be noted is that शङ्कराचार्य's masterly presentation of the पूर्वपक्ष and its equally able refutation evince his comparative outlook and his wider *use of the comparative method* in his भाष्यs. We have already seen how he comparatively quotes the views of other systems about Superimposition in his अध्यासभाष्य. Again, while telling that the Individual Soul (आत्मन्) is identical with ब्रह्मन् he comparatively states various conflicting views held by the लौकायतिकs, बौद्धs, नैयायिकs, साङ्ख्यs and योगिन्s about the nature of आत्मन् (ब्र. सू. १।१।१). The tenets of the साङ्ख्यs are put forth in a greater detail, in several parts of the ब्रह्मसूत्रभाष्य, than those of others and repeatedly refuted according to the maxim of 'प्रधानमल्लनिबर्हण' (vanquishing the most formidable adversary). This, however, does not mean that there is no adequate presentation of the tenets of other systems in the ब्रह्मसूत्रभाष्य. The main features of those systems have, of course, been presented according to their relative importance. All this doubtless shows *the extensive use of the critical, comparative and scientific methods* and the process of arriving at the *Higher Synthesis* of all systems in ancient India.

IX THE HISTORICAL METHOD

This general survey of Methodology in ancient India naturally leads us to the Historical Method, which is conspicuous by its absence in the Sanskrit literature. This does not, of course, mean that the Sanskrit literature does not at all possess records of past events. The ब्राह्मणs contain इतिहास (legends), पुराण (cosmogonic myths), and नाराशंसी (songs in praise of heroes), which form parts of the अर्थवाद and yield grains of historical truth. All these component parts of the ब्राह्मणs developed later on, by the addition of new elements, into the epic poetry of the रामायण and the महाभारत. Both these give us indications of certain historical facts and the latter is generally called इतिहास. In the later पुराणs* too there are some parts in which historical matter is embedded. Why, the whole of Sanskrit literature being a record of past events may be said to contain vestiges of historical truth. Besides, oral tradition has handed down to us from generation to generation accounts of the past, some of which may be included under history. The Sanskrit literature is, however, a confused mass of myth and history. The Hindus have all along been very careful in preserving such records of the past, yet they have never cared to sift the historical material from the mythical one for want of

* सर्गश्च प्रतिसर्गश्च वंशो मन्वन्तराणि च ।
वंशानुचरितं चैव पुराणं पञ्चलक्षणम् ॥

historical sense in them.† Even if it can be said that the Hindus might not have preserved their records of the past unless they had some historical sense, it ought to be admitted that they did not possess the 'historical sense' in the modern connotation of that expression. The only ancient Sanskrit works that partially stand the test of the modern connotation of 'history' are the 'राजतरङ्गिणी of कह्लण, the हर्षचरित of बाण, the विक्रमाङ्कदेवचरित of बिल्हण and the शिवभारत of परमानन्द. We have formerly seen that the पौराणिकs accept 'सम्भव' (probability) and ऐतिह्य (tradition) as separate प्रमाणs. If probability be taken to be one of the marks of history, we come somewhat nearer to the modern historical conception. For, oral tradition or records of the past which come generally under शब्दप्रमाण (verbal testimony) must agree

---

† "Nevertheless, one must not believe, as it has so often been asserted, that the historical sense is entirely lacking in Indians. In India, too, there has been historical writing; and in any case we find in India numerous accurately dated inscriptions, which could hardly be the case if the Indians had had no sense of history at all. It is only true that the Indians, in their writing of history, never knew how to keep fact and fiction strictly apart, that to them the facts themselves were always more important than their chronological order, and that they attached no importance at *all*, especially in literary matters, to the questions of what was earlier or later...The authors of astronomical books generally also give the exact date of the day on which they completed their work. Since the fifth century after Christ, inscriptions too begin to give us information about the dates of many authors."

—M. Winternitz–A History of Indian Literature, Vol. I, Introduction.

with the valid knowledge (प्रमा) gained by प्रत्यक्ष-प्रमाण (Perception). But this does not, of course, include the whole modern sense of 'History', as there are works (Poetry, drama, novels, etc.) which are merely the products of imagination, though they do not contradict perceptual experience and contain 'literary truth' rather than 'historical truth.' The details gained from oral tradition or records must be corroborated by the authentic records (inscriptions, documents, coins, copper-plates, etc.) of *events that have actually taken place* in the past. This modern idea of history comprises not only records of political events of the past, but also records of *all human activities,* physical, mental, moral, religious and social, or of the whole civilization of a race on the earth in a *chronological order.*

In history then time and space, on which all the empirical (व्यावहारिक) life of man depends, are the most important factors. Philosophically speaking, the truth of history is, therefore, the relative truth of the phenomenal plane (व्यावहारिक सत्ता) and not the absolute truth of Ultimate Reality. As seen formerly, philosophy gives its sanction to the relative truth of the phenomenal plane, since almost all human beings carry on their dealings on the phenomenal plane. Hence, history, historical truth and historical method, though they are relative, find their proper place in the ascending scales of truth as recognized by the Hindu philosophy and may seek their development. All this

phenomenal life of names and forms is a continuous and changing whole passing through various phases of time and place. The six stages of existence (भावविकार) viz., origination, existence, modification, growth, decay and destruction (जायते, अस्ति, विपरिणमते, वर्धते, अपक्षीयते, विनश्यति) are, therefore, applicable to this phenomenal life; and history, which necessarily deals with that life has, of course, to take into account all these stages or modifications. Time and place are then held to be the causes of those modifications, since the passage of time as much brings about a change in the activities, ideals, customs, etc., of a race as the place or environment in which that race lives. Change of locality and contact with other races too are factors causing modifications in ideals, activities, etc. There is, however, *a substratum of racial character which remains unchanged on account of the particular environment in which a race lives on for ages, and that substratum becomes its hereditary property designated as 'Culture'.* To trace chronologically all those modifications of human beings in the past as they have actually taken place, so as to shed light on the present, is then the task of 'history' according to the modern conception of that word.

If the connected history of a particular race in its proper sequence of particular events is to be written on the basis of all available evidence, oral and written, the historian has to undergo a special kind of mental discipline, which becomes the historical method in its wider application. Always aiming

at the historical truth the historian, irrespective of the distinction between the conquerors and the conquered, will have to employ Logic for differen tiating the authentic from the spurious sources and history from legend. In other words, the verbal testimony (tradition and records) will have to be judged in the light of प्रत्यक्षप्रमाण (Direct perception) and अनुमानप्रमाण (Inference) in order to ascertain the high probability (सम्भव) of an event. This is the place where the Historical Method will be amalgamated with the Critical Method. If any source is found to contradict those two means of valid knowledge, it will have to be rejected. The authentic and internal sources, i. e., actual documents, inscriptions, letters etc., of a particular period will be valued more than external sources referred to in the general literature of a country, as they are of the nature of an indirect or circumstantial evidence. Even actual documents will lose their value as authentic sources, if they are found, by judgment and other sources, to favour a particular party of the period by deprecating the other. In this case the internal evidence will have to be supplemented by the external one. It always happens that in the case of scanty internal evidence gaps in history have inevitably to be filled in by external evidence. But under no circumstances will the historian make an assertion that is not based on some authentic source. Unfortunately historical investigations do not always result in the certainty of a particular event, but at most give the indications of its high probability.

Mohammedan travellers, and the fixed dates of Buddha, Chandra Gupta, Ashoka, etc. It is thus found that archaeology, epigraphy, etc., form the branches of historical investigation, and all of them collectively help chronology. The growth of Sanskrit language can be traced through three broad stages, viz,. the Vedic Sanskrit, the Brahmanic Sanskrit and the Paninian or Classical Sanskrit; and the sequence of Sanskrit authors can be broadly determined according to the periods allotted to them. The Hindus also seem to have already known the general sequence of the वेद्s, the ब्राह्मणs, the सूत्रs, the स्मृतिs, the भाष्यs and the काव्यs, the succeeding ones of which generally presuppose the preceding ones; and more ancient works are relatively held more authoritative. There is, however, some room for alteration in this sequence according to the modern well-defined criteria. Again, the Hindus too have their own chronology (e. g. the eras of युधिष्ठिर, विक्रम, महावीर, शालिवाहन, etc.) and science of astronomy, according to which they assign dates to different personages. Yet, all these eras are used more for daily religious observances than for determining the dates of historical facts. The Western scholars, on the other hand, invariably prefer for their own convenience the Christian era to the former ones in assigning dates to several facts of Indian history, and the Hindu scholars follow them in this respect. It must be admitted here that the Western scholars, barring some exceptions, exhibit, on the whole, a minute, methodical and critical point of view in

their chronological researches; and this point of view is worthy of being accepted by the Hindu scholars in their own researches.

Chronology gives a definite form to the sequence of events either in the history of the corporate life of a nation or in the history of the individual life of a person. From this point of view it is very instructive to settle the sequence of several works written by the same author like कालिदास by noting the stages of growth in his ideas, outlook on life and the linguistic form suited to his ideas. Chronology which thus seeks to divide immeasurable Time into suitable periods, or social as well as individual life into stages, naturally induces us to compare one period or stage with another on the basis of similarity or contrast. The sentence ' History repeats itself' is true in the case of social as well as individual life. It is, therefore, natural for a man with historical insight to compare and contrast one period with another and synthesize all periods by discovering correlation among them. Thus life-problems, ideals, customs and all sorts of mental and physical activities of different periods can be subjected to the Comparative Method, which in alliance with the Historical Method establishes the causal relation of incidents. This comparative method which makes use of the उपमानप्रमाण (comparison, analogy) further leads us in the light of history to ascertain the influence of one individual, race or period upon another and understand the nature of the whole life, individual or corporate, in its proper

perspective. Thus for being able to have the perspective of the whole life of a nation the historian has to undergo a rigorous mental discipline. After making use of verbal testimony (शब्द), perceptual knowledge (प्रत्यक्ष), inference (अनुमान), comparison (उपमान), probability (सम्भव) and tradition (ऐतिह्य) he has to amalgamate the chronological, critical, scientific and comparative methods with the Historical Method, which principally proceeds along the course of Time. He has then to present all particular facts of history in their sequence, with the proper perspective of the whole material, and with due attention to the *permanent substratum of national character*. He has, therefore, to take into account the *spirit or soul* of all the multifarious activities of a nation through different periods, and present, after eliminating all unnecessary details with a keen sense of proportion, those historical facts alone that bring out this soul. This is the modern idea of history and the science of historical composition. This scientific charater was lent to history and historical composition only in the 18th century A. D., by the Europeans, and it need not appear strange that it was unknown to the ancient Hindus.

When it was found that the same mental process or discipline that was required for historical investigation was also widely applicable to other departments of knowledge, the Historical Method of general application came into existence. That method is now widely employed for investigation

into almost all branches of human knowledge like mythology, religion, philosophy, psychology, education, art, literature, philology, textual criticism, Vedic interpretation, studies in Classical Sanskrit, etc., and has yielded fruitful results, which have enabled different authors to write the history of some of those subjects. It must be acknowledged that this Historical Method of study which was non-existent in India is worthy of being availed of by us. It is an undeniable fact that the Shastris are well-versed in the use of the above-mentioned प्रमाणs propounded by the ancient Hindus. If they will collectively make use of all of them with particular attention to the course of Time, sequence of events and chronology, they will find it very easy to master the Historical Method. If they are adepts in पद, वाक्य and प्रमाण which are certainly far more abstruse than the Historical Method, they will very easily be able to adopt the Historical Outlook in respect of Sanskrit literature and Shastras.

It has been said above that the task of the historian is not merely to arrange historical facts in their chronological sequence, but also to bring out the causal relation of them and to interpret them in a generalized form. Arrangement of particular facts of history in the light of the historical discipline described above is a topic properly belonging to the Science of History; while the *generalized interpretation* of those particular facts on the basis of the *causal relation* falls regularly within the province of the Philosophy of History. The Philosophy of History

is, therefore, a development of the Science of History, and requires, in addition to the same kind of mental discipline as required by the latter, the *synthetic* outlook of philosophy and an eye for the culture or soul of a nation rather than for physical events. For being able to give a rational and comprehensive interpretation of historical facts the Philosophy of History has also to depend upon the principles of psychology, logic, metaphysics and ethics. It has thus to see how the human mind works in different situations, what is the most satisfactory theory of the creation of the universe propounded by philosophy in general, and how the generalized interpretation of history is to be presented in a rational manner. It has, moreover, to evaluate human activities leading to success or failure, worldly prosperity or emancipation of the soul, and to show how those activities, external and internal, or individual and corporate, should be *regulated* and sublimated in the present and the future, so as to reach the final goal. In this respect the comparative method will have to be employed in order to compare the events that have successively taken place in a nation and those in one nation with those in another.The Western Philosophy of History usually seeks the aid of the Evolution Theory for generalized interpretaion. But that theory is inadequate, since it cannot explain what the substratum of that evolution is, whether there would be continuous evolution of humanity, or whether the processes of evolution and devolution, or rise and fall, occurring

on the same substratum, are true in the case of man. Here the idea of the creation of the universe propounded by the Hindu thinkers is a valuable aid to the Philosophy of History; for, it clearly explains that the creation, sustenance and dissolution of the universe occur on the same eternal substratum (ब्रह्मन्), that both the evolution and devolution of humanity depend upon the proportion in which human activities approach or depart from that substratum, and that there is no continuous development, but there are development and decay; rise and fall alternately occurring in the destinies of humanity. The Hindu thinkers divide all human activities into सात्त्विक, राजस and तामस, and further say that the quality of रजस् creates the universe and leads to worldly prosperity, the सत्त्व sustains both and leads to emancipation, and the तमस् dissolves everything and leads to destruction. On the basis of those three qualities they have conceived the idea of four युगs (ages) and classified in a philosophical manner the collective activities of humanity in terms of four युगs. They, therefore, concerned themselves more with the Philosophy of History than with history, pure and simple. It cannot, however, be denied that they could not have given us a consistent Philosophy of History, unless they had some measure of historical sense in themselves. With this historical sense they have described in detail particular facts of history in the रामायण, the महाभारत and the पुराणs for the purpose

of philosophizing on them. The only flaw is that those historical facts have been promiscuously mixed with myths and are not given in their chronological sequence. The Hindu thinkers have, however, never failed to remark rationally that those myths and legends are not to be understood in their literal sense but are to be taken as mere 'अर्थवाद' for approaching the Ultimate Truth.

If from the philosophical point of view even the 'historical truth' is relative, and if that relative truth is meant for the Ultimate Truth, the ancient Hindus need not be much blamed only for their deficiency in unmixed historical and chronological sense. If their process of approach to the Ultimate Truth through the relative truth is correct, in other words, if they reach the real end which is aimed at by the philosophy of history, they should not be much deprecated for adopting purely mythical means along with the relatively real (historical) ones. It is true that they ought to have possessed a finer historical sense for arriving at the 'historical truth'. But when the modern Westernized scholars begin to magnify this fault and depreciate the Shastris for it, one cannot help remarking that the modern scholars too are deficient in the philosophic outlook on life and Shastric acumen possessed by the ancient Hindu thinkers and some Shastris even of the present day. It will have to be admitted that the Shastric acumen on the one hand and the historical sense on the other are products of different kinds of mental discipline, though it is

possible to amalgamate them in a few cases. When the modern scholars usually express their perverted opinion that the Shastris do not possess 'critical insight', they use the word 'critical' in a narrow and vague sense to suggest the 'historical', or more properly, the 'chronological' sense. The word 'Research' is similarly used by them in the narrow sense of 'historical and chronological research.' If the word 'critical' prominently connotes the sense 'logical' or 'rational', the Shastris are 'critical' enough. It is really strange that the Shastris should be called 'uncritical' simply for want of historical and chronological judgment, when it is quite clear that they can use rigorous logic or the critical, comparative and scientific methods in their search for the Ultimate Truth. It is then desirable that the activities of the modern scholars and Shastris should henceforth start with mutual understanding and cooperation, and should result in making up the deficiency. Nobody can deny the importance of historical truth on the phenomenal plane; yet the means should not be mistaken for the end, and the part which history and historical method have to play in our Sanskrit studies should not be unduly stressed to the detriment of more important branches of Sanskrit literature.

It has been formerly remarked that the Historical Method is applied to many branches of human knowledge and that the history of a particular branch in relation to the past and present achievements gives a proper perspective of the whole sub-

ject. *Again, in alliance with the comparative and critical methods it supplies us with a wider outlook,* deepens our interest in a subject, trains us in rationalism, makes the dead past alive, and helps us to see things with a new meaning. In spite of all these merits this method has its limitations. For, engaging us more in the sequence and chronology of events, and in the analysis of facts rather than in their synthesis, it tends to divert our minds from the *spirit* or *substratum* of events. In other words, it keeps us absorbed in the particular facts of history rather than in the philosophy of history. It is to be remembered that mere history can at best furnish us with concrete illustrations of actual and particular facts, which are inadequate unless they are put to the hard test of Logic and its प्रमाणs, or supplemented by the philosophy of history. For, *the knowledge of truth, relative or absolute, depends upon impartial judgment and the logical* प्रमाणs, *which are superior to mere history.* It ought to be, therefore, properly understood that the Historical Method, which stresses the sequence and chronology of events more than other things, is *one* among many methods of approach to a subject and *not the only* method. It must be admitted here that when the particular historical events themselves have yet to be discovered and collected in an organized form of history, the adoption of the Historical Method is most essential. Remembering, therefore, the above limitations of the method it should be employed with judicious

care without neglecting other important methods of approach to a subject.†

If this method is applied, for instance, to the study of literature, its merits and demerits are clearly perceived. The merits of the method lie in bringing before our mind the perspective of the whole literature in its synthetic form, in indirectly helping our appreciation of it, in presenting individual authors of that literature in their sequence, in enabling us to judge the influence of one author upon another, in making us ascertain the place of a particular author in his age and the whole literature, and in aiding us to account for changes in literary ideas and forms from age to age. Thus the Historical Method helps in its own way the study of literature, just as literature too supplies history, in a more or less degree, with facts of historical interest. Now the limitations of the Historical Method as applied to literature are as follows:—

Though the Historical Method ultimately results in synthesis, it prominently adopts logical analysis and impartial judgment, which give little scope for emotional attitude quite essential to the appreciation of literature. Even if it can supply us with an *intellectual explanation* of the circumstances in which a literary work was produced, it cannot help us in the actual enjoyment of the aesthetic

† In this context read Dr. Bhandarkar's two essays: 'The Critical, Comparative and Historical Method of Inquiry' and 'Lines for Fresh Research in Sanskrit Literature and Indian Antiquities' in the Collected Works of Sir R. G. Bhandarkar, Vol. I. pp. 362-415.

doubted fact that the ancient Hindus had definite views on the art of interpretation or teaching, and that ancient teachers consistently employed the methods detailed in the foregoing sections. Those methods, logical as well as psychological, clearly indicate that exclusive use of the Analytical Method was never made even in the teaching of शास्त्रs. The *methods were Analytico-Synthetic* rather than Analytical, and the advanced teaching of शास्त्रs was also made concrete and interesting by quoting several familiar examples (उदाहरण, उपमान). It is then needless to say that 'Literature', which itself is naturally concrete in ideas and form, was taught in a still more concrete and interesting manner, by introducing several examples and a good deal of information required for its clear understanding and enjoyment. While referring to the qualifications of a good teacher कालिदास significantly says in his मालविकाग्निमित्र*: "Some teachers have profound knowledge of their subject, while others are proficient in the art of imparting. But one, in whom deep knowledge is coupled with the art of imparting, is the best teacher." What कालिदास here means is that a teacher, besides being a profound scholar, should try to think objectively from the pupil's point of view also, so as to make his teaching

* श्लिष्टा क्रिया कस्यचिदात्मसंस्था संक्रान्तिरन्यस्य विशेषयुक्ता ।
यस्योभयं साधु स शिक्षकाणां धुरि प्रतिष्ठापयितव्य एव ॥
—मालविकाग्निमित्रम् । १।१६

impressive. भवभूति, like a modern psychologist, recognizes individual differences in students, when he says from the pupil's point of view that there is much difference as regards the results of teaching between clever pupils and dullards, though the teacher imparts instruction in the same subject to both of them.* These definite views about teaching and teachers have been corroborated by Yuan Chwang, the Chinese pilgrim of the 7th century A. D., as follows—"These teachers explain the general meaning [to their disciples] and teach them the minutiae; they rouse them to activity and skilfully win them to progress; they instruct the inert and sharpen the dull. When disciples, intelligent and acute, are addicted to idle shirking, the teachers doggedly persevere repeating instruction until their training is finished." §

The modern Shastris, on account of their deep knowledge of व्याकरण, मीमांसा, न्याय, वेदान्त and साहित्य, have inherited the same ancient methods of पद, वाक्य and प्रमाण which they use in their oral teaching. One fact must, however, be noted that all Shastris are not well-versed in all those शास्त्रs collectively, but are proficient in one शास्त्र alone with the rudimentary knowledge of other systems.

---

* वितरति गुरुः प्राज्ञे विद्यां यथैव तथा जडे
न तु खलु तयोर्ज्ञाने शक्तिं करोत्यपहन्ति वा ।
भवति च पुनर्भूयान् भेदः फलं प्रति तद्यथा
प्रभवति शुचिर्बिम्बग्राहे मणिर्न मृदां चयः ॥ उत्तररामचरितम्—२।४

§ Yuan Chwang's Travels in India, by Thomas Watters.

Detailed explanation of each and every word and its sense (पदपदार्थ) line by line, which helps the *intensive study* of a book, is the noteworthy quality of almost all of them. Their explanation, however, culminates in the complete exposition of अलङ्कार, ध्वनि and रस contained in *individual verses or paragraphs only.* They are not much inclined to exhibit their expository skill in bringing out synthetically the *whole mind* of a poet as revealed in all his works or at least in one work *as a whole.* In this respect the synthetic and psychological method of literary criticism employed by the Western literary critics is worthy of imitation.

It must be remembered that भरत, आनन्दवर्धन and अभिनवगुप्त, who have contributed original theories of रस and ध्वनि to the Sanskrit Poetics (साहित्य), are the pioneers in the field of *synthetic literary criticism.* They have rightly subordinated अलङ्कार, गुण and रीति to the principles of रस and ध्वनि, or more properly to the रसध्वनि, which will be detailed later on. आनन्दवर्धन in the fourth उद्योत of the ध्वन्यालोक has given his illuminating *synthetic appreciation* of the महाभारत, which certainly deserves to stand the test of modern literary criteria, and would be a proper guide to Sanskrit literary critics wishing to follow that path. This path has, however, been rarely followed by the later आलङ्कारिकs and Sanskrit commentators, who have wasted their energy in the minute analysis of अलङ्कारs in detached verses. The only Sanskrit commentary that makes

an *emotional approach* to poetry and tries to enter into the *heart* of the poet by explaining the inner significance of words is the 'विद्युल्लता' commentary of पूर्णसरस्वती on the 'मेघसन्देश' (मेघदूत) of कालिदास. The ancient Sanskrit works aiming at synthetic criticism, according to our limited information, are the महाभारततात्पर्यनिर्णय of श्रीमध्वाचार्य and the धर्माकूतम् of त्र्यम्बकराय मखिन्; but they have been written mainly with the ethical rather than with the literary or aesthetic purpose. The solitary instance of synthetic *literary* criticism, on the model of आनन्दवर्धन's appreciation of the महाभारत, is the concluding passage of राघवभट्ट's commentary on the शाकुन्तल. In the present century, however, two Pandits have attempted synthetic literary criticism through the Sanskrit medium in the light of the Western standard. Of them Pt. R. Krishnamachariar, M. A., has written his रघुवंशविमर्श, मेघसन्देशविमर्श, and कुमारसम्भवविमर्श in felicitous Sanskrit prose; while MM. Pt. कालीपद तर्काचार्य in his काव्यचिन्ता has attempted aesthetic appreciation of the works of कालिदास and भवभूति in equally beautiful Sanskrit Prose. These two Sanskrit critics have in modern times set a worthy example to other Sanskrit critics in respect of *synthetic literary criticism*, which seeks to approach the Personality of a poet. Rabindranath Tagore's synthetic and emotional appreciations of Sanskrit poets, published in his Bengali book 'प्राचीन साहित्य' are unparalleled in the realm of literary criticism, since they are the specimens of creative art

and testify to the sentence of Ben Jonson: "To judge of poets is only the faculty of poets, and not of all poets, but the best." In short, synthetic and emotional appreciation of Sanskrit poets through the medium of Sanskrit is a desideratum felt long.

In spite of the ancient principles of रस and ध्वनि and the above-mentioned books comprising synthetic appreciation, the Shastris in general unnecessarily stress the intellectual process of the minute analysis of अलङ्कारs, in which respect even the University graduates blindly follow them. There are, again, a few Shastris, who consider it below their dignity to teach 'Literature', and say that poetry is to be sung by harlots (रण्डागीतानि काव्यानि). If such Shastris are sometimes required to teach 'literature', their lessons, which mostly comprise grammatical or etymological discussions, are uninteresting and tiresome to young pupils. Barring a few such exceptions there are a good many of them, who with real zest for literature have developed fine literary taste in themselves, and hence are able to develop aesthetic attitude among their pupils. Such Shastris are undoubtedly able to maintain interest and enthusiasm among their pupils by expounding literature in an enchanting manner. Thus though all Shastris are at one in generally following the theories of पद, वाक्य, प्रमाण and साहित्य in their teaching, their methods in regard to the treatment of literature vary from person to person.

There is, therefore, no standardization among the Shastris as regards the methods of teaching

literature and the number and sequence of steps to be followed in their lessons. The actual steps used by the Shastris in a 'Literature Lesson' vary from five to eight. An ancient couplet gives five steps to be followed while a literary subject is being expounded to pupils of tender age. They are (i) Separation of Sandhis in words; (ii) Meaning of words; (iii) Dissolution of compounds; (iv) Construing of words or sentences; and (v) Answer to an objection.*

In consultation with several Shastris in the different parts of India, we have been able to determine that in spite of a few variations, five common steps are generally adopted everywhere for the teaching of prose as well as poetry. In their succession they are as follows:—

(i) Separation of Sandhis in words (पदच्छेदः); (ii) Construing (अन्वयः); (iii) Dissolution of compounds (समासविग्रहः); (iv) Explanation of words unknown to pupils (पदार्थकथनम्); (v) Substance of a sentence, paragraph or verse (तात्पर्यम्). $

Here, according to the needs of pupils and the nature of the language material to be taught the Shastris add 'Parsing of words' after पदच्छेद,

---

* पदच्छेदः पदार्थोक्तिर्विग्रहो वाक्ययोजना ।
आक्षेपस्य समाधानं व्याख्यानं पञ्चलक्षणम् ॥

$ These five steps may be versified as follows:—
पदच्छेदोऽन्वयोक्तिश्च समासादिविवेचनम् ।
पदार्थबोधस्तात्पर्यं व्याख्यावयवपञ्चकम् ॥

'Translation' after पदार्थकथन, and 'Discussion of constructional aspect' (प्रयोगविवेचन) after तात्पर्यकथन as three more steps, which are dropped when the pupils are sufficiently advanced. Notwithstanding the general adoption of these five formal steps, there is full scope for the ingenuity of a tactful teacher in the treatment of his topic. One thing to be borne in mind is that every 'literature lesson' is accompanied by loud reading, which is mostly neglected in the grammar-translation method. Again, in all such lessons, pupils are required to take more active part than the teacher, who generally guides and corrects the pupils where necessary.

Reading— Generally at the initial stage the teacher reads for pupils, but after some acquaintance with language, pupils are invariably made to read a passage loudly, at the beginning of every lesson. Of course, for fear of adverse criticism from the teacher, the pupils have to practise this reading beforehand. While the reading is going on, attention is always to be paid to distinct articulation, pitch of voice, intonation, pause, emphasis, phrasing, etc.* From all these points of view the reading of the Shastris is expressive and flawless, so that it would serve graduate teachers as a model for imitation. It is worthy of note that many Shastris can repeat from memory several passages in prose and verse and can teach even without the aid of a book. Thus, being free to discourse direct-

* The detailed treatment of all these will be found in 'Reading and Recitation' in this book.

ly with their pupils, they can gain the advantage over graduate teachers of making their personal influence felt more.

(*i*) *Separation of Sandhis* (पदच्छेदः)–Separation of Sandhis in a sentence or verse follows the reading of the same. Here also the pupils have to take more part than the teacher as before. Along with this separation of Sandhis, the grammatical form of every word has to be recognized by the pupils. By this continued practice in the separation of words pupils develop their knowledge of Sandhis incidentally without learning rules; and when the forms of different words in a sentence are known beforehand by pupils from the रूपावलिs, the matter of splitting Sandhis becomes an easy task for them. With the knowledge of the basic facts of the vernacular grammar, pupils are here able to give all the parts of speech, viz., a noun, a pronoun, an adjective, a verb, an indeclinable, etc. After eliciting the original forms of words (i. e. the nominative singular), pupils are led to recognize the different cases of words as used in a sentence or verse, and to connect those forms by analogy with the forms of model words already learnt in the शब्दरूपावलि. This is the place where pupils realize the utility and importance of having at their fingers' ends the forms in the रूपावलि. This procedure is resorted to at the initial stage until pupils get sufficient practice in the ready recognition of the grammatical froms of words. Although this process makes for the clear understanding of

each and every word, beginners find it rather irksome and lengthy. If young pupils are by nature more intent on the human element (story-interest) of a passage than on the grammatical forms of words, it would be expedient to postpone this detailed parsing of words to a later stage. We must, however, note that this sub-division of the first step is not compulsorily followed by all Shastris.

(ii) Construing or arrangement of words (अन्वयः)–The second step to be followed in a 'literature lesson' is 'construing' or the arrangement of words in their syntactical order. Taking into account the facts indicated above, the Shastris, in expounding literature to their students, follow a few syntactical rules, which have been recorded in some Sanskrit manuals † for beginners and which undoubtedly train those students in construing literature by self-help. It is well worthy of note that the students of the Pathashalas are able to construe any unseen passage in Sanskrit, after the study of a few cantos from a महाकाव्य; while the students of high schools and colleges cannot do so even after studying Sanskrit for years. It is, therefore, highly desirable to bring the knowledge of those syntactical rules to bear upon the understanding of literature.

(a) दण्डान्वयः–'Construing' or the arrangement of words in their syntactical order is the most

† Read:—(a) रघुरामकृतः 'श्लोकयोजनिकोपायः', (b) ओङ्कारदासविरचितः 'अन्वयबोधः', and (c) The concluding portions on कारक in the 'समासचक्रम्'.

important step in a 'literature lesson'; and its proper knowledge is indispensable to the study of Sanskrit literature. When the arbitrariness of the order of words in a Sanskrit sentence necessitates this arrangement even in a prose passage, it is needless to say that verses also must be construed. For being able to construe, definite knowledge of the function of cases or कारक, as indicated above, is to be presupposed; and the most important fact to be borne in mind is, first of all, the functions of the nominative and accusative cases. So the first thing for the students to do is to find out for themselves or sometimes with the help of the teacher the principal sentence which generally consists of the subject, the object, and the finite verb. For this purpose it is necessary for them to know that in the active construction the subject is in the nominative case and the object in the accusative. When students are able to determine the inflexions of all words, they can easily distinguish the nominative from the oblique cases and find out the subject. Now, the subject can occur in a sentence in any one of the three persons and numbers, and the finite verb must agree with it in respect of both of them. If a participle is used as a finite verb, it should agree with the subject in person, number and gender also. Being equipped with this information, students can readily construe the subject with the verb or the verb with the subject according as either of them is expressed or understood. If the verb is understood, it is to be supplied according to the form of the

As the forms of *indeclinables* are unchangeable under all circumstances, there need be no difficulty in construing them with their respective words.

Verbal forms denote an action, complete or incomplete. Those denoting a complete action are finite verbs or participles used as finite verbs, which are either active or passive, which show three tenses, and are to be construed with the subject and the object according as they are transitive or intransitive. Verbal forms showing an incomplete action are absolutives and infinitives, which are invariably to be placed before finite verbs. The object to an absolutive or infinitive must, of course, precede either of them. In the case of verbs governing two accusatives, the direct object should be placed just before the finite verb and after the indirect one. In short, for arranging words in a Sanskrit sentence according to their syntactical relations, the subject will have to be placed first, words in the accusative and other cases afterwards, absolutives and infinitives with their objects, if any, in the middle, and the finite verb last. The construing method, in which all the words of the whole sentence are thus arranged, is named as 'दण्डान्वयपद्धति'. 'दण्ड', which means 'a staff' with many knots represents the whole sentence with its various parts or sections (खण्ड); or in Sanskrit 'दण्ड' is the vertical punctuation mark used to denote the completion of a sentence. Thus, the construing of words in a complete sentence standing between vertical marks is designated as 'दण्डान्वय'. Hence, in the दण्डान्वय-

पद्धति all the words in a complete sentence are arranged according to their grammatical function and syntactical relation. While construing, the Shastris, with due attention to these syntactical rules, desire their students to have the inner working of their minds as indicated above. So in this method questions in the mother tongue as, 'Which is the subject?', 'Which is the object?', 'Which is the verb?' etc., are asked to bring out the natural order of words in a sentence. Yet, such questions being mainly of a grammatical or formal type bore the pupils. *Such a procedure, no doubt,* helps clear understanding and is suited to the pupils of very small classes where individual attention is possible. But for large classes it would be monotonous.

(b) खण्डान्वयः—$ There is another method of construing, 'खण्डान्वयपद्धति' by name, which resembles the former only in respect of picking out first the principal sentence, but differs from the दण्डान्वय with regard to the construing of the remaining words of the whole sentence. In the खण्डान्वयपद्धति the use of several interrogative words in suitable Sanskrit questions enables the exponent to elicit

---

$ दण्डवत् खण्डवच्चैव द्विभेदोऽन्वय उच्यते ।
आद्ये विशेषणं पूर्वं विशेष्यं तदनन्तरम् ॥
क्त्वाणमुल्ल्यप्प्रभृत्येवं पूर्वं दण्डान्वये भवेत् ।
—ओङ्कारदासविरचितः 'अन्वयप्रबोधः'

commentaries on the पञ्चमहाकाव्यs *and some works on Shastras by the commentators following the* खण्डान्वयपद्धति. These question forms can be advantageously utilized at one's discretion in the teaching of Sanskrit by maintaining variety in questioning. The characteristic of a Sanskrit sentence, however, is that its major portion generally consists of adjectives which are either single words or sentences compressed into a बहुव्रीहि compound. It is, therefore, inevitable that the same question forms with the use of कीदृश, कथम्भूत etc., have often to be resorted to, there being little scope for variety in the wording of such questions every time. We thus see that the questioning in the खण्डान्वयपद्धति draws the attention of students more to the *spirit* or the *sentiment* of a literary piece than to its grammatical aspect; and hence, according to the accepted technique of modern teaching the humanistic side of language study can be more attended to in the खण्डान्वयपद्धति than the formal one.

Again, there are two possible ways in which the subject and the verb of a principal sentence may be elicited. In the दण्डान्वयपद्धति the subject is generally picked up first and the verb afterwards; while in the खण्डान्वयपद्धति the verb, which is first picked up, is connected with the subject and the object by framing suitable questions. These two methods are based on the principles laid down by the नैयायिकs, मीमांसकs and वैयाकरणs. The नैयायिकs are of opinion that the subject is the principal word in

a sentence; the मीमांसकs assert that the verbal form is the principal word to which all the words in a sentence are related; and the वैयाकरणs hold the root-meaning of a verbal form to be important. So the दण्डान्वयपद्धति seems to have its source in the theory of the नैयायिकs; while the खण्डान्वयपद्धति owes its existence to the theory of the मीमांसकs. For practical purposes no distinction need be observed in regard to the precedence of the subject or the verb in construing. Yet the खण्डान्वयपद्धति, which is superior to the दण्डान्वय in appealing to the students' instinct of curiosity and their literary sense, naturally leads us to side with the मीमांसकs, who recognize the precedence of the verb and the importance of आकाङ्क्षा.

With special reference to the खण्डान्वयपद्धति we may say that the knowledge of expectancy (आकाङ्क्षा), consistency (योग्यता) and contiguity (आसत्ति or संनिधि) as recognized by all schools of thought is quite essential to 'construing' or comprehension of a sentence.$ When a word cannot convey the whole meaning of a sentence owing to the absence of some other word, there is expectancy (आकाङ्क्षा)§ or the desire to know the other word. For instance,

$ आकाङ्क्षा योग्यता संनिधिश्च वाक्यार्थज्ञानहेतुः । (तर्कसङ्ग्रहः) । वाक्यजन्ये च ज्ञाने आकाङ्क्षायोग्यतासत्तयस्तात्पर्यज्ञानं चेति चत्वारि कारणानि । (वेदान्तपरिभाषा)

§ (a) पदस्य पदान्तरव्यतिरेकप्रयुक्तान्वयाननुभावकत्वमाकाङ्क्षा । (तर्कसङ्ग्रहः)

words in a sentence are not placed in juxtaposition, the sentence would make no sense, although the words in it might possess आकाङ्क्षा and योग्यता.

It will thus be seen that आकाङ्क्षा, योग्यता and संनिधि, the causes which yield the construed or unified meaning of a sentence, are usually taken to be the characteristics of words. Really speaking, 'आकाङ्क्षा' (Expectancy, desire to know), which is a property of the human mind, contains mainly a psychological element. For, it is not words but human beings that have a desire to know. But 'expectancy' is attributed to words in a secondary sense (उपचार), since a word conveys a meaning which further arouses in the mind of a reader or hearer a desire to know the meaning of another word connected with it. $ Again, योग्यता (Compatibility, consistency) concerns itself more with *meanings* or *things* denoted by words than with words themselves. योग्यता, which is really a property of things, is attributed to words in a secondary sense, as things and words denoting them are closely related. It is only आसत्ति or सनिधि (Contiguity) that is properly a property of words themselves. In short, the process of construing, particularly that in the खण्डान्वयपद्धति, is

---

$ सा (आकाङ्क्षा) चैकपदार्थज्ञाने तदर्थान्वययोग्यार्थस्य यज्ज्ञानं तद्विषयेच्छा 'अस्यान्वय्यर्थः कः' इत्येवंरूपा पुरुषनिष्ठैव, तथापि तस्याः स्वविषयेऽर्थे आरोपः । अयमर्थोऽर्थान्तरमाकाङ्क्षतीति व्यवहारात् । ... पदं साकाङ्क्षमिति तु साकाङ्क्षार्थबोधकमित्यर्थकम् । इ०

(नागेशकृता परमलघुमञ्जूषा)

based on the psychological principles of language-study propounded by the Hindu schools of thought.

In connection with 'आकाङ्क्षा', which may psychologically be termed 'curiosity' it can definitely be said that several traces of the modern technique of reformed teaching are found scattered in the vast range of Sanskrit literature. In ancient times, *the method of questions and answers* that owes its rise to this आकाङ्क्षा was a method of wider application in oral teaching. Various dialogues in the Upanishads, भगवद्गीता, योगवासिष्ठ, महाभारत etc., and the dialogue-form predominantly employed in the ancient works on different शास्त्रs (व्याकरण, मीमांसा, etc.) are, as it were, the actual records of the oral lessons (प्रपाठकs) given, and bear ample testimony to the fact that the method of questions and answers was largely used in expounding a subject, though in later times this ancient method was replaced by the 'Lecture Method' in the शाङ्करभाष्य and similar works. The method of questions and answers may thus be said to have been developed in the infancy of humanity, while the 'Lecture Method' came into existence to suit the advanced stage of human understanding. This fact further proves the psychological truth that the Method of Questions and Answers is very well suited to the curiosity and capacity of juvenile as well as average students; whereas the Lecture Method can be effective only when the students' understanding, power of concentration, and capacity for passive listening are sufficiently advanced.

The ancient method of questioning, however, differs in some respects from the modern one. According to the modern technique chiefly the teacher has to ask questions and the pupils to answer them; whereas in ancient times comprehensive questions (परिप्रश्न) were asked by students, and teachers answered them. Answers were given by ancient teachers at the psychological moment when the curiosity of the pupils had been fully awakened (उत्थिताकाङ्क्षा) by trying to discover things for themselves as in the Heuristic Method. Sometimes the teachers, by making use of 'Suggestion' in their teaching, created opportunities to rouse the curiosity (उत्थाप्याकाङ्क्षा) of their pupils or bring about the psychological moment, when the need for explanation would be badly felt. Besides, the ancient teachers having an exceptional power of supplying concrete and apt illustrations repeatedly utilized the means of knowledge called 'comparison' (उपमानप्रमाण), and told interesting stories for expounding highly philosophical abstractions. In short, आकाङ्क्षा (expectancy or curiosity) along with योग्यता (consistency) and संनिधि (contiguity) forms the backbone of the खण्डान्वयपद्धति, which can be designated as the 'Dialogue Method', 'Conversational Method' or the 'Method of Questions and Answers'.

In contrast with the दण्डान्वयपद्धति questions in the खण्डान्वयपद्धति are *asked in Sanskrit* and not in the mother tongue; for, the construing of a Sans-

krit passage is manifestly possible in Sanskrit alone. Construing a Sanskrit poem or a prose passage in the mother tongue is a contradiction in terms, and it is as unnatural as dissolving Sanskrit compounds in the mother tongue! It is, therefore, against nature and common sense to ask questions in the mother tongue to get at Sanskrit prose order. If questions in the mother tongue could be asked on a Sanskrit passage, they would possibly be of the formal type as referred to in the treatment of the दण्डान्वयपद्धति. But when the खण्डान्वयपद्धति is adopted, questions have to be framed *mainly on the subject-matter* and *secondarily on the grammatical forms of words.* If exclusive use of the mother tongue is made for eliciting even the subject-matter, the answers received from students must obviously be in the mother tongue. Where is then scope for attending to the original language of a passage and ascertaining the inter-relations of words in a sentence? It is really unintelligible how according to the खण्डान्वयपद्धति vernacular questions could be framed on a Sanskrit passage in prose or verse, and be answered in the vernacular! The procedure appears to be so artificial that on account of this prominence of the mother tongue in a literature-lesson, the Sanskrit language of the passage without being studied is in danger of being thrown over-board!

For a good grasp of Sanskrit, due attention to its syntax and other peculiarities ought to be paid, though it would be a means to the end which is

primarily the understanding and appreciation of literature. Various constructional aspects of Sanskrit would be properly attended to, if *the actual wording of a Sanskrit passage would be elicited from the pupils for supplying full explanation in simple Sanskrit;* and this is made possible only through *Sanskrit* questions. These are some of the reasons why in the खण्डान्वयपद्धति questions are asked in Sanskrit and not in the mother tongue.

Too much adherence to the usual question-forms in the खण्डान्वयपद्धति is likely to result in monotony, to avoid which variety in the wording of questions will have to be maintained. For instance, at the initial stage instead of dissolving compounds in the prosaic traditional way, questions should sometimes be so framed that the compounds might of themselves be dissolved, and that the pupils might be led to understand intuitively the mutual relations of their different members. The questions at the initial stage should again be amplified by other questions asked to elicit even the subject, object and verb of the principal clause, which in the खण्डान्वयपद्धति is purposely isolated from the whole sentence and supplied by the teacher or the commentator through a statement. Again, at the advanced stage of the study of Sanskrit, intelligent questions according to the खण्डान्वयपद्धति will have to be framed with tact to get at the subtle suggestion (व्यङ्ग्यार्थ) of words or a passage, to ascertain the purport (तात्पर्यार्थ) of a literary piece, to elicit the imagery of a poem by appealing to the emotions

and imagination of students, to bring the poet's felicity of expression to their notice, and to impress upon their minds the writer's outlook on life.

Although the Shastris are aware of this खण्डान्वय-पद्धति on account of their study of Sanskrit commentaries, they do not seem now-a-days to bring it into practice. Perhaps, being fond of reading learned commentaries written in a high-flown style they generally disfavour the simple and loose style of the खण्डान्वयपद्धति, which for the very reason conduces to the better understanding of students. Or possibly, owing to a very small number of pupils in their classes they are not required to adopt this method; and they find it convenient for such compact classes to have recourse to the दण्डान्वय, which is more favourable for 'lecturing' than for 'questioning'. When the 'Lecture Method' is still so much prevalent all over India even in English Schools and Colleges in spite of the advent of improved methods of teaching, it would be unjust to deprecate the Shastris for relying much on the 'Lecture Method'. The खण्डान्वयपद्धति, though not practised by the Shastris in their teaching, *has been widely used in Sanskrit commentaries on famous poems and other classics. For explaining abstruse thoughts in different* शास्त्रs, *as in the* व्याकरणमहाभाष्य *of* पतञ्जलि *

* (a) "In Katyayana and Patanjali we can already recognise the technical reasoning, the dialectics of the Purva-Mimamsa and the philosophical schools, where the doubts and difficulties are formulated as dilemmas and where the solution of

and the मीमांसासूत्रभाष्य *of* शबरस्वामी, *this method has been invariably used. Thus the* खण्डान्वयपद्धति

---

one dilemma starts the formulation of a new dilemma and so on in a long stream of debate, and where even the accuracy of expression seems to acquire mathematical exactness."

—Studies on Panini's Grammar, by Barend Faddegon, p. 42.

(b) The method of Patanjali's Great Commentary–"This method is analogous to that which has become familiar through the classical commentaries of शङ्कर on the Upanishads, of मेधातिथि and कुल्लूक on मनु, of सायण on the Vedas, of विज्ञानेश्वर on याज्ञवल्क्य, and so on. Its character chiefly consists in establishing, usually by repetition, the correct reading of the text, in explaining every important or doubtful word, in showing the connection of the principal parts of the sentence, and in adding such observations as may be required for a better understanding of the author. Patanjali even excels in the latter respect, the commentaries instanced, for he frequently attaches his own critical remarks to the emendations of कात्यायन, often in support of the views of the latter, but not seldom, too, in order to refute his criticisms and to defend पाणिनि; while, again, at other times, he completes the statement of one of them by his own additional rules." —Panini, by Goldstucker, p. 100.

(c) "The महाभाष्य is interesting stylistically as giving us a lively picture of the mode of discussion of the day. A question is posed; an आचार्यदेशीय deals with it, not altogether incompetently but not quite satisfactorily, and an आचार्य solves the issue. The style, therefore, is lively, simple, animated, and ...... not rarely do we find the question 'Wherefore?', 'How?', or 'What?' put and then answered. Proverbial expressions and references to matters of everyday

is not only useful in juvenile teaching, but is also of immense advantage in the higher study of Sanskrit. But the Shastris, notwithstanding their familiarity with this खण्डान्वयपद्धति, have not realized the value of their own method as the most effective means of studying and teaching language. On the other hand, University students, who study Sanskrit, being more disposed to rely upon English translations of Sanskrit works than read original texts with their Sanskrit commentaries, are quite in the dark about the खण्डान्वय. If a few of them ever care to read Sanskrit commentaries, they mostly come across commentators like मल्लिनाथ and others, who have almost adopted the दण्डान्वय for explanation. They do not at all know that there are many published as well as unpublished Sanskrit commentaries on काव्यs, written according to the

---

life are introduced and serve both to enliven the discussions and to give us valuable hints of the conditions of life and thought in the time of Patanjali, who thus is a source of information for religious and social history as well as for literature."

"The सूत्र [The पूर्वमीमांसासूत्र] develops a method which is common to Indian science generally, and which was adopted by the writers on law; the subject is posed, the doubt is raised; the *prima facie* view is set out; then the correct decision is developed, and the matter brought into connexion with other relevant doctrines."

—A History of Sanskrit Literature, by A. B. Keith.

खण्डान्वयपद्धति,† *which is the continuation of the Dialectic Method of* पतञ्जलि *and others, and which, being perfectly psychological, can be brought into line with the most effective methods of teaching language as recently developed in the West.* Owing to this ignorance the graduates, who were keenly intent on the improvement of Sanskrit teaching, could not bring the indigenous खण्डान्वयपद्धति

---

† The following are some of the Sanskrit commentaries representative of the खण्डान्वयपद्धति—

१ नैषधीयचरितम्—नैषधीयप्रकाशाख्यनारायणीयटीकासहितम् ।

२ शिशुपालवधम्—वल्लभदेवविरचितसन्देहविषौषधिव्याख्यासनाथम् । [वल्लभदेव is a well-known Kashmirian commentator of the first half of the 10th century A. D.]

३ कुमारसम्भवम्—नवनीतरामकृतबुद्धिबोधिनीव्याख्यायुतम् । [Unpublished]

४ मेघदूतम्—वल्लभदेवविरचितमेघदूतविवृतिसमेतम् ।

५ मेघदूतम्—स्थिरदेवकृतव्याख्यासनाथम् ।

६ यशस्तिलकचम्पूः—श्रुतसागरसूरिकृतचन्द्रिकाख्यव्याख्यासहिता ।

७ गीतगोविन्दम्—कुम्भनृपतिप्रणीतरसिकप्रियाव्याख्यासहितम् ।

८ गीतगोविन्दम्—शङ्करमिश्रनिर्मितरसमञ्जरीसमेतम् ।

९ अमरुशतकम्—अर्जुनवर्मदेवप्रणीतरसिकसञ्जीवनीयुतम् ।

१० सूर्यशतकम्—त्रिभुवनपालप्रणीतटीकासहितम् ।

११ साम्बपञ्चाशिका—राजानकक्षेमराजविरचितविवृतिसमेता ।

१२ राघवपाण्डवीयम्—शशधरकृतप्रकाशटीकासहितम् ।

१३ युधिष्ठिरविजयम्—राजानकरत्नकण्ठकृतटीकासहितम् ।

१४ हीरसौभाग्यम्—श्रीदेवविमलगणिविरचितस्वोपज्ञव्याख्यासहितम् ।

to light and had to look for help at the Direct Method of the West!

After judging the relative merits of these two methods of construing, we find that the खण्डान्वय is far superior to the दण्डान्वय in respect of language-teaching. In the first place, it is purely a psychological method suited to the instincts of pupils, since predominance of questioning in it is expected to arouse their curiosity (उत्थाप्याकाङ्क्षा) to the fullest extent and maintain constant interest in the classroom. Secondly, it is more suitable for group teaching than for individual teaching. Particularly for the large modern classes where heterogeneous types of pupils are trying to avail themselves of the ancient lore enshrined in Sanskrit, the खण्डान्वयपद्धति of the Sanskrit commentaries is the proper method calculated to ensure co-operation between the teacher and the taught. Thirdly, in the individual and intensive study of original Sanskrit works of a higher type, the commentaries following the खण्डान्वयपद्धति are sure to enlighten a student by making clear the inter-relations of words and ideas, nay, every minute detail, through the questions employed in them. Fourthly, the खण्डान्वय is more appropriate than the दण्डान्वय for the teaching of poetry. Prose order or the regular construing in the दण्डान्वय mars the beauty of a poem instead of enhancing it; while questions in the खण्डान्वय can be so framed as to bring the emotional content of a poem into prominence and lead the

pupils to understand automatically the relations of different words in a sentence. Thus the खण्डान्वय helps us to bring out the hidden charm of a poem, heightens our sentiments and creates living poetic atmosphere which is most desirable for the real appreciation of that poem. In short, the खण्डान्वयपद्धति bears close resemblance to the Direct Method, which in actual use is much akin to the 'Question-and-answer Method' that forms the main part of language lessons. It is worthy of note what the modern authorities on language-teaching say about this 'Question-and-answer Method'—

"Question-and-answer work is the most effective of all the language-learning exercises ever devised. In its various forms and grades it initiates, develops and utilizes the natural language-learning forces with which we are all endowed. It is the quickest and most effective approach both to the spoken and the written aspects of the language; it is the shortest cut to writing; and it may be adopted for purposes so diverse as the teaching of conversation, of abstract grammar, of composition, and of pronunciation".—'This Language-learning Business', By H. E. Palmer, and H. V. Redman.

It is needless to add here that the above remarks are equally applicable to the खण्डान्वयपद्धति. Now that we have discovered that the indigenous खण्डान्वयपद्धति, when it is amalgamated with the usage of elders (वृद्धव्यवहार), is much the same as the Direct Method, many misconceptions about the New Method of teaching Sanskrit will vanish. When

we can see so much agreement between both these methods, will it not be unjust now to say that we are imitating the Westerners? Of course, in the light of the Western Principles of Language-Study, which also coincide with the main principles of the Indian schools of thought, the खण्डान्वयपद्धति will have to be modified a little to suit the present needs.

After thus dealing at length with the utility and importance of the second step of a 'Literature' lesson according to the Shastri method, and taking into account the manifold purposes for which their खण्डान्वयपद्धति could profitably be used, it would now be advisable to turn to the remaining steps.

(iii) Dissolution of compounds (समासविग्रहः) *and (iv) Explanation of words unknown to pupils* (पदार्थकथनम्).

As both these (i. e. the third and the fourth) steps are adopted simultaneously by the Shastris instead of following them one after the other, it is expedient to combine the two into one. For, the meaning of a compound is not understood unless individual words in it are explained; and the meaning of the whole sentence cannot be grasped unless all the compounds in it are dissolved. Again, in order to dissolve compounds correctly, it is necessary to know their proper context, which can be known only after understanding the meaning of the remaining words in that sentence. This is why in the Shastri method the dissolution of compounds and explanation of unknown words go on side by side.

If thus the interdependence of both these steps leads us to the clarification of the meaning of the whole sentence, it is in the fitness of things that both of them should be mixed together. Nay, as the questioning alone in the खण्डान्वयपद्धति enables us to combine the stages of पदच्छेद and अन्वययोजना with the above two stages, the fourfold procedure of separating the Sandhis, construing, dissolving compounds and explaining unknown words goes on side by side in a unified form. Questioning, then, is the most important stage which facilitates the automatic separation of Sandhis in the same way in which it does the automatic dissolution of compounds. Now, although 'the dissolution of compounds' and 'explanation of unknown words' are mixed together in the खण्डान्वय as well as in the दण्डान्वय, convenience of treatment obliges us here to devote individual attention to each of them.

(iii) Dissolution of compounds—Sanskrit language is noted (not 'notorious', as some people wrongly suppose) for its compounds, which are decidedly of much help in securing brevity of expression. As already remarked, the striking example of this brevity is found in the बहुव्रीहि compound into which a whole sentence can be compressed. We must, however, acknowledge the fact that some Sanskrit authors being fond of elaborate and florid style have carried the tendency of using compounds to excess, and made their style highly artificial and obscure at the sacrifice of lucidity. But this particular fact does in no way permit one to

generalize about the notoriety of the whole of Sanskrit literature for its compounds. दण्डिन् while treating of the गौडी style in contrast with the वैदर्भी or the best style, defines † ओजस्(vigour) as the profusion of compounds; and rhetoricians agree that super-abundance of compounds is the characteristic of the गौडी style.* Any way, students of Sanskrit literature must be conversant with compounds which, as indicated formerly, presuppose the knowledge of case-relations (कारकs).

Pupils can be presumed to possess some knowledge of compounds through their study of poetry in the mother tongue. This knowledge can be turned to good account while teaching Sanskrit, and made more definite and exact by asking the pupils to study the समासचक्र,$ so that they themselves would be able to dissolve compounds without the aid of the teacher. Thinking that the समासचक्र serves all the practical needs of beginners, the Shastris value the applied knowledge of compounds more than mere theoretical knowledge, and give their pupils ample drill in recognizing and dissolving them in the proper context of literature.

---

† ओजः समासभूयस्त्वमेतद्गद्यस्य जीवितम् ।
पद्येऽप्यदाक्षिणात्यानामिदमेकं परायणम् ॥——काव्यादर्शः, १।८०

* ओजःप्रकाशकैर्वर्णैर्बन्ध आडम्बरः पुनः ।
समासबहुला गौडी......॥– साहित्यदर्पणः, ९।४

$ The di-tinguishing features of the main varieties of compcunds with their examples and ways of dissolution are briefly but very clearly given in the समासचक्र as follows:–

In the case of a difficult and lengthy compound the Shastris themselves supply its literal meaning, which can express in the mother tongue all the विभक्तिs implied in that compound; and then they ask their pupils to use the corresponding विभक्तिs in Sanskrit. Here the Shastris say from a practical point of view that the length of a compound need not scare the pupils away, if the meanings of its several members are known. Their practical and useful hint for ascertaining the number of smaller compounds in a larger one is to ask the pupils to count all the words in the whole compound and then subtract the number 'One' from them. For instance, if a compound contains five words, the number of smaller compounds in it is generally four. Moreover, the Shastris show by precept and example how, while dissolving a larger compound, two components of it have to be taken each time, and how the preceding smaller member is to be connected with the following one.

(*iv*) *Explanation of words unknown to pupils*: At the initial stage the Shastris who follow the दण्डान्वयपद्धति generally use the mother tongue as the medium of instruction; and the more the pupils are advanced in understanding, the more they make use of the Sanskrit medium. It is then obvious that

---

चकारबहुलो द्वन्द्वः स चासौ कर्मधारयः ।
यस्य येषां बहुव्रीहिः शेषस्तत्पुरुषः स्मृतः ॥
वृक्षशाखा तत्पुरुषः श्वेताश्वः कर्मधारयः ।
रक्तवस्त्रो बहुव्रीहिर्द्वन्द्वश्चन्द्रदिवाकरौ ॥

at the elementary stage the meaning of every word unknown to the pupils is given by them in the mother tongue, at the intermediate stage simple Sanskrit equivalents are supplied along with their vernacular meanings, and at the advanced stage the mother tongue being dispensed with, Sanskrit explanation is given in the manner of Sanskrit commentaries. This, however, does not mean that the use of the mother tongue is totally banned at the advanced stage, or that all the Shastris without an exception employ the Sanskrit medium for higher teaching. Still this *oral explanation in Sanskrit* trains the pupils in the ready recognition of the language heard, establishes a 'direct bond' between words and ideas, makes for the assimilation of Sanskrit, and enlarges Sanskrit vocabulary. Moreover, the Sanskrit explanation paves the way for the study of Sanskrit commentaries, the reading of which is generally recommended at the advanced stage by the Shastris with a view to initiating their pupils in the art of construing literary passages for themselves and thus training them in self-help.

Along with the vernacular or Sanskrit explanation, lines from the *Amara-Kosha* are quoted every now and then by the Shastris in order to show how several synonyms can be found for a particular word in the text. These frequent quotations from the Amara-Kosha remind the pupils of the verses already learnt therein, show them how the 'अमर' can now be used intelligently in the proper context of the text, and help them to enrich their Sanskrit

vocabulary. We may incidentally remark here that although the frequent quoting of the अमरकोश at the time of teaching literature greatly helps the pupils to memorize words in their context, it is needless to burden the memory at least of average pupils at their tender age with the learning of the *whole* of the अमरकोश, which is merely a collection of versified word-lists without any context. This learning of the अमरकोश is, even in the opinion of some learned Shastris, a wastage in education, as the major portion of it is forgotten unless pupils get an opportunity of studying a good deal of literature. If we desire average pupils to use the अमरकोश with advantage, it would be expedient to introduce select verses from it in the context of literature, and recommend the use of an abridged edition of it like the अमरसार of Prof. Gole to them for constant reference and memorizing.

Some Shastris think that this explanation of individual words would not suffice, and in order to ensure clear understanding, they ask their pupils to give in a synthetic form the vernacular translation of a verse or a sentence. This process of translating need not be considered much objectionable from the psychological point of view. For, even according to the New Method *occasional use of translation* is made to test the understanding of pupils. As has been convincingly proved by H. E. Palmer in 'The Scientific Study and Teaching of Languages', translation is not so 'indirect' as the staunch adherents of the Direct Method suppose.

On the contrary, it is more 'direct' than a more difficult Sanskrit synonym or paraphrase, and a vague, roundabout explanation in Sanskrit.$ Again, what is the use of explaining the word 'सरल:' by the word 'वृक्षविशेष:', 'चम्पकम्' by 'पुष्पविशेष:', 'मन:शिला' by 'धातुविशेष:' or 'कृकवाकु:' by 'पक्षिविशेष:', when the corresponding equivalents in the mother tongue are more apt and intelligible than the above? Even after taking into account all the merits of the Direct Method we find that *the establishment of the 'direct bond' is limited only to concrete objects, things or actions.* Besides, in spite of the scrupulous avoidance of the mother tongue in the class, it is not possible for the teacher to prevent his pupils from mentally translating and thinking in the mother tongue what is spoken in the class, or from consulting an elderly person at home for vernacular equivalents or the translation of a Sanskrit passage. It is, therefore, quite necessary, in the interest of pupils, to resort occasionally to 'translation into the mother tongue.' Experience also tells us that even though a Sanskrit passage be taught by the Translation Method, *'the direct bond' between Sanskrit words and ideas*

$ "Translation is a more direct mode of conveying the meaning of a unit than Definition, and *a fortiori*, more direct than context". p. 88.

"The exclusion of translation as a regular means of conveying the meaning of units is an uneconomical and unnatural principle". p. 93.

—'The Scientific Study and Teaching of Languages'
by H. E. Palmer.

in it can be established simply by asking the pupils to practise the loud and fluent reading of that passage for a number of times.

There are, however, other reasons why the sole use of the Translation Method for language-teaching is open to objection. In the adoption of the Translation Method in schools and colleges, it is, at present, the teacher who plays a more prominent part in the class-room than the pupils do. The teacher all the while translates literally the sentences of a passage one after another, and the pupils, having no scope for self-activity, either listen passively to what is said by the teacher, or take down what is dictated by him. Excepting a few conscientious pupils the majority of them are either inattentive or sleepy. Again, the quality of this translation is low, since little attention is paid in it to the felicity of expression or the idiom of the mother tongue. All this procedure, being laborious and disgusting, is against psychology and the technique of teaching, both of which emphasize more self-activity on the part of the pupils. We are thus faced by the new problem of group-teaching and class-management, to solve which, more effective methods must be adopted. The खण्डान्वयपद्धति or 'The Question-and-answer Method', as we have already observed, is of great service in giving full play to the activity of pupils and in keeping them all alert and active in the class.

The plan of the Shastris to use the Sanskrit medium for teaching in a gradually increasing

proportion is, we think, more natural than that of the Direct Methodists who employ the Sanskrit medium only at the elementary stage and recommend the use of the mother tongue at the advanced stage! Thus the Direct Method as practised at present in the teaching of Sanskrit is inadequate to the higher classes, where the Translation Method is mostly followed as an invariable alternative by the average teachers who feel diffident of using the Sanskrit medium. *But the* खण्डान्वयपद्धति, *which unifies the two rival methods, viz., the Direct Method as well as the Translation Method, and incorporates all the best qualities of the old and new, or the Eastern and Western methods of teaching in an organized whole, is the only complete method embodying the 'eclectic' principle, and promises to be of immense advantage at the initial as well as the advanced stage of learning Sanskrit.* A close study, therefore, of Sanskrit commentaries written according to the खण्डान्वयपद्धति is calculated to show the teachers of Sanskrit effective ways of supplying Sanskrit explanation through questions.

(*v*) *Substance or purport of a sentence, paragraph or verse* (तात्पर्यम्): The fifth step actually followed by the Shastris in 'literature' lessons is 'तात्पर्यकथन' or the 'telling of the purport.' This fifth step is psychologically and logically an essential step, since it sums up in a synthetic form what is taught in detail according to the खण्डान्वय-पद्धति. In the adoption of the खण्डान्वयपद्धति as former-

ly treated of at length, the matter to be taught is, as it were, scattered on a wide area by the process of analysis through questions; and this circumstance might perhaps make a subject incomprehensible from the viewpoint of young learners. It must, however, be remembered that the method of खण्डान्वय is not simply an analytical process of separating a sentence into its component parts, but it is an *analytico-synthetic* process in which several analysed members of a sentence are combined through the *comprehension of the inter-relations of words* by means of the principles of आकाङ्क्षा, योग्यता and सन्निधि; and at last, the students are led to the unified and comprehensive meaning or Purport (तात्पर्य) of a sentence or passage as a whole. In short, what is analysed by the खण्डान्वय is again synthesized by this Purport or Drift. This drift is generally *told* by the teacher in a sentence or two; but it may also be *elicited* from the pupils by asking questions according to the खण्डान्वय. Yet, in order to avoid too much of the monotony of the *questioning process* and to bring variety in teaching, it would be better for the teacher actually to *tell* the drift than ask questions on it. The drift is usually repeated twice at the beginning and end of a new 'thought-unit' (a sentence or passage). It is first stated in the form of an 'अवतरणिका' (introductory remark)† or

---

† The commentaries written by आनन्दगिरि on the भाष्यs of शङ्कराचार्य are generally in this form of अवतरणिकाs, which

प्रतिज्ञा, before presenting the details of a thought-unit, after which it is repeated for the second time at the close of that thought-unit. What is newly learnt is thus cemented by this repetition of the Purport. The purport that is told at the beginning in the form of 'प्रतिज्ञा' is again logically turned into 'निगमन' or conclusion at the end. This process goes on from the first step to the fifth and *vice versa* in a cyclic order, and presents a finished form to the teaching of that thought-unit. This repetition of the purport further creates the unified impression of a topic as a whole, and is psychologically sound in so far as it gives the idea of the 'whole', particularly in the अवतरणिका, before the learning of its parts. Modern psychology not only sanctions the learning, in general, of the *whole* before its *parts,* but combines the 'whole' and 'part' methods of learning into a Joint Method for a quick and ready recollection of the subjectmatter. Thus the method of खण्डान्वय and the function of तात्पर्य both together create the unified impression of a subject, aid memory by making for the assimilation of what is taught and lead to the mastery of the subject learnt.

XI THOUGHT AND LANGUAGE.

In connection with the तात्पर्यकथन it is necessary to understand the scientific meaning of 'तात्पर्यवृत्ति'

---

give synthetically the purport of the पङ्क्तिs of भाष्यs and facilitate clear understanding of the original.

incarnation of परा वाक्. In short, Speech is Thought itself in its developed form.

From this metaphysical point of view 'thought' and 'speech' are not two distinct entities, but speech is identical with thought. No relation can, therefore, be established between both of them except that of superimposition (अध्यास). But if from the phenomenal point of view speech is held for some time to be distinct from thought, then speech may be said to be the effect of thought which is the cause. Thought and speech are thus inseparably connected with each other. In the वेदाङ्गशिक्षा the psycho-physical process of the development of speech from thought is described as follows:—

" The Individual Self determines by his reasoning power the meanings (thought) to be expressed. With a desire to communicate them to others he impels his मनस् (mind) to action. The mind makes its effort to push the internal heat (at the navel), which further impels the internal breath to rise. This internal breath after moving through the passage in the chest produces a low murmuring sound."* With all this internal effort the breath allied with a motive or purpose starts from the मूलाधार—centre of the body, where it is designated as 'परा वाक्' or speech of the unconscious level.

---

* आत्मा बुद्ध्या समेत्यार्थान् मनो युङ्क्ते विवक्षया । मनः कायाग्निमाहन्ति स प्रेरयति मारुतम् । मारुतस्तूरसि चरन्मन्द्रं जनयति स्वरम् ॥

(वेदाङ्गशिक्षा, ६–७).

This breath rises up to the navel (नाभि) and is on the point of coming to the conscious level, when speech is called 'पश्यन्ती'. The same internal breath comes up to the chest (उरस्, हृदय), and being transformed into a distinct thought of the conscious level, it assumes the form of speech called 'मध्यमा'. This inaudible form of speech is indicative of the स्फोट (essence of speech) of the वैयाकरणs.† When the same breath reaches the glottis (कण्ठ) or mouth, the speech, which was thought itself at the former stage, is changed now into an audible sound (ध्वनि) which is termed 'वैखरी'.$ This वैखरी develops into human speech or language that is used in daily affairs. All languages on the earth are on a par with one another up to the limit of the 'मध्यमा' speech which consists of thought; but when they reach the level of वैखरी, they are diversified into languages of several countries. Human speech or language is, therefore, a developed form of वैखरी, and it consists of words combined into sentences according to a desired sequence. Really, the desire or purpose of the speaker himself comes into contact with the objects of the world and attaches meanings to words in relation to them. All words in language are,

---

† मध्यमानादोऽर्थवाचकस्फोटात्मकशब्दव्यञ्जकः। (परमलघुमञ्जूषा, ४).

$ परा वाङ् मूलचक्रस्था पश्यन्ती नाभिसंस्थिता। हृदिस्था मध्यमा ज्ञेया वैखरी कण्ठदेशगा॥ वैखर्या हि कृतो नादः परश्रवणगोचरः। मध्यमया कृतो नादः स्फोटव्यञ्जक उच्यते॥ (परमलघुमञ्जूषा, ४).

sense. An entity distinct from letters must, therefore, be postulated for coneying sense.

This entity is, according to the वैयाकरणs, 'स्फोट' or the eternal sound-essence. The वैयाकरणs recognize two forms of a word. One form is all the non-eternal and audible sounds (ध्वनि) in language expressed by the वैखरी-speech. The other form is the eternal and inaudible sound-essence (स्फोट), which is *the unifying principle* of all non-eternal words and their meanings, and which is indicated by the मध्यमा-speech. Of these two the latter is principal with reference to the former. All non-eternal words in language are, therefore, the effects of the eternal cause or ultimate germ of words known as 'स्फोट'. This eternal and indivisible स्फोट contains eternal meanings in their unmanifested form and is responsible for assigning the same meaning to the same articulate word denoting an object or person. Even though letters or words disappear as soon as they are uttered, yet the स्फोट, which is the cause of lending unity to a word and its meaning, remains unaffected. What the non-eternal letters, words or sentences in language do here is that when they are uttered in succession from the first to the last, they simply reveal or suggest, in a more and more distinct and synthetic form, eternal meanings already contained in the unmanifested स्फोट. Thus the perception of the last letter of a language-unit (a word or a sentence) aided by the impressions of preceding letters is only instru-

mental in making the eternal sense flash suddenly before our mind as an indivisible whole. Again, as the स्फोट is divested of parts, it is manifested as a unity directly indicating the meaning of a word, sentence, paragraph, etc. The order of letters, words, sentences, etc., is an unreal and conventional attribution to the स्फोट which is without order or sequence; and the grammatical process of analysing words or sentences into component parts is imagined only for conducting affairs in life and for facilitating the understanding of novices. Thus, as things on the earth and sounds in language (i. e. letters, words, etc.) are intimately connected with the स्फोट, words express themselves as well as the meanings of things in relation to the स्फोट. One thing must be noted here that it is the sound (letters, words, etc.) that is first cognized and then its meaning, and that the meaning is *not produced* but is *revealed* by letters, words, and others. The वैयाकरणs have enumerated eight varieties of स्फोट; but they hold 'वाक्यस्फोट' to be the principal and real one. They say that *a sentence alone can reveal complete meaning, i. e., a sentence is the unit of language*; while letters and words are subordinate to that sentence. This principle well corresponds with the Western principle of language-study that a sentence is the unit of language.

The Indian schools of thought (साङ्ख्य, मीमांसा, वेदान्त, न्याय and वैशेषिक) except that of योग do not find it necessary to postulate this स्फोट or sound-essence.

They either take only the physical (external) view of 'शब्द्' or accept 'वर्णवाद्' which embodies the principle that letters (वर्ण) are expressive of sense, though there are subtle differences among them as to whether 'शब्द्' is eternal or non-eternal. If we look at the internal aspect of 'शब्द्', we need not say that the स्फोटवादिन्s are very far from truth, since their स्फोट can be identified with the मध्यमा-speech of the प्रणव (ओम्) propounded by the Upanishads. But शङ्कराचार्य, who sides with the वर्णवादिन्s thinks that the theory of स्फोट is superfluous and complicated. Quoting the opinion of उपवर्ष, an ancient मीमांसक and वेदान्तिन्, he has refuted the theory of स्फोट in his illuminating भाष्य (ब्र. सू. १-३-२८) and psychologically explained the relation between thought and word by establishing that letters can convey sense. A summary of his arguments will not be out of place here. He says as follows—

' A word is not the स्फोट but it is a group of letters (वर्ण). That the letters क, ख and others vanish as soon as they are uttered is a false notion. For, we have always the experience: "I repeat the same letter 'क' that I uttered before." This experience is proved to be true in respect of every letter and it is called 'recognition' (प्रत्यभिज्ञा). This experience is not based upon likeness, since we do not say:' This letter क is like that letter क' but say: 'This is the same letter that I uttered before.' The experience of recognition is based upon the identity of

past and present experience not upon likeness. Again, this recognition rela self to the individual letters क, ख and others and to their class-notion (कत्व, खत्व, etc.); for, diff ce among individuals along with their similar should be seen before they can be included i class. As only identity of letters is recognized b instead of their difference, we must conclude th e have the recognition of individual letters an t of their class. For instance, when we repeat th ame word 'गौः', it is said that the word 'गौः' ha been repeated twice and not that two words ' are repeated. If any differnce is observed am g individual letters क, ख, etc., it is due to the ternal influences such as voice, pronunciatior accentuation, etc., and not due to the innate n re of letters. The recognition that the same le ers are uttered is due to the inherent nature of i dividual letters themselves. As sense can be g hered from a group of such letters, it is unneces ry to postulate the theory of स्फोट.

If is said that the sense in the form of स्फोट flash out suddenly in the mind after it has rec ved impressions left by the perception of si le letters, it may be replied that this is the sy*thetic activity of the mind* (समस्तप्रत्ययमर्शिनी बुद्धिः) t at is also connected with letters. For, after each letter of the word 'गौः' [ग्+औ+ः] has been perceived in succession, the synthetic power of the mind forms collectively a single concept which is connected with the aggregate of letters and not

with स्फोट. As th. 'nifying mental activity refers only to letters, it c ot be an indication to prove the existence of स्फोट ich is different from letters. For instance, when ti rord 'गौः' is desired to be spoken, only the letter and others occur to the mind; and the letters and others of a word which is not desired be spoken do not occur. If the object cognition for the unifying activity of the 1 d is स्फोट which is different from the letters ग् ar. others, then there is no reason for ग् and others t ccur to the mind, just as there is no reason for word beginning with ट् to occur, when a word be nning with ग् is desired to be spoken. But this de not happen. Hence the *synthetic* mental activity which refers to the aggregate of letters is not abou स्फोट, but is only a recollection connected with the le ers. Again, it is also possible for the different letter of a word to become the *object* of a single concept, s in the case of words like पङ्क्ति (row), वन (fore t), सेना (army) and others. The collective sense c each of these words is understood by the synthetic mental activity, though each one contains several individual things or members (i. e. trees, soldiers). The same unifying mental activity forms an aggregate of the different letters contained in a word.

One would object to this that if only letters combined into an aggregate to form a word would become an object of a *single concept*, there would be no difference between words like 'कपि' (ape)

and 'पिक' (cuckoo) on account of the occurrence of the same letters. But it may here be explained that though the aggregate of letters (of a word) would be the object of cognition to the mind, yet those letters would occur to the synthetic mental activity according to their *desired sequence* in that word, just as ants going one after another give us the idea of a row. Although the letters in a word would, perhaps, be the same, the particular sequence of them would help us to differentiate one word from another. The usage of elders (वृद्धव्यवहार) has established that when letters with a particular number are grouped and arranged in a particular sequence, they should be associated with a particular meaning; and when a child begins to learn a language, those letters, though they are perceived singly one after another, are similarly unified by his (or her) synthetic mental activity into different words, which invariably convey particular meanings according to the predetermined sequence and number of letters. This process of understanding the sense from letters, as propounded by the वर्णवादिन्s, is simpler than that propounded by the वैयाकरणs on the basis of the theory of स्फोट. Thus शङ्कराचार्य concludes his भाष्य by saying that in the hypothesis of स्फोट there is a negation of facts that are actually perceived (दृष्टहानि) and an assumption of what is not perceived (अदृष्टकल्पना). That letters uttered in succession reveal the 'स्फोट' and that this स्फोट again reveals the sense

a cow after understanding the meaning of the
mmand, the words (i. e. the sentence) 'गामानय'
t be related to that action. He thus broadly
cludes that the meaning of the action of bring-
'ग़ cow must be the meaning of the sentence
perso' Again, the boy hears the first elderly
'w), saying to the second, 'गां बधान' (Tie the
'd observing that the cow has been tied
ordin y, he infers that the sense of tying the
Thiest e the sense of the sentence, 'गां बधान'.
as co. 'he understands broad senses of words
elderly ' in sentences. He again hears the first
(Bring a h saying to the second, 'अश्वमानय'
ing the hor and observing the action of bring-
sentence 'अश्वम infers that the words in the
as before. After e related to the said action
turally begins to com ng these sentences he na-
In the sentences 'गामान them. He then finds that
'गाम्' is common, and thad 'गां बधान' one word
tied is also common. Then beast brought and
of *inclusion and exclusion* he mental process
he excludes the individual wordsप्रोवाप—अन्वयव्यतिरेक)
and takes the common word गाम् to नय and बधान,
Thus a *direct bond* (relation) between a 'a cow'.
and the beast 'cow' being established in word गाम्
he understands the meaning of that in s mind,
word. Similarly by the comparison of the sent dual
'गामानय' and 'अश्वमानय' and by the process of nces
clusion and exclusion (अन्वयव्यतिरेक) he finds that

the word 'आनय', which is common, was repeated twice in connection with the same action of bringing, and concludes that 'आनय' must mean 'Bring'. This is generally the process by which a child learns to speak.* Here the child understands the senses of individual words, only when they are *combined in sentences* and not independently of any context or relation.

As the meaning of a word is understood only in relation to the other words or context of a connected sentence, the process of learning a language by popular usage is otherwise called 'अन्विताभिधान'† (expression of the connected), and the प्राभाकरमीमांसकs, who propound this theory of अन्विताभिधान, are called अन्विताभिधानवादिन्s. The अन्विताभिधानवादिन्s say that the सङ्केत or शक्ति (convention, power) that such and such a word should have such and such a sense, is understood through the *connected sense* of a sentence and in relation to an object, person or action also. Hence, according to the अन्विताभिधानवाद *a sentence is the unit of language* and not an independent word. The नैयायिकs and आलङ्कारिकs have recognized this theory of अन्विताभिधान as a mode of learning the significance of words, though they do not lend complete support to it. The वेदान्तिन्s, as referred to above, give due importance to the

---

* See pp. 60-61.

† अन्वितानामेव अर्थान्तरसम्बद्धानामेव पदार्थानामभिधानं शब्दैः प्रतिपादनम् ।

usage of elders, and the वैयाकरण्s call it 'शक्तिग्राहकशिरोमणि' (the foremost among the modes of knowing the meaning). The वैयाकरण्s do not recognize the existence of a word as apart from the indivisible sense (अखण्डार्थ) of a sentence (वाक्यस्फोट), i. e., they think that a word is unreal with reference to the word-essence (स्फोट) which is real; while the अन्विताभिधान-वादिन्s recognize the separate existence of a word as a part of a sentence. Yet they lay more stress on the *construed meaning* (अन्विताभिधान) of a sentence than on the individual meaning of a word. Hence according to the अन्विताभिधानवादिन्s it is first the sentence that is understood in its connected form and then its constituent words. As in popular usage a child understands connected sentences before understanding their separate words, a sentence is the unit of thought and speech according to the 'अन्विताभिधानवादिन्s. It will thus be found that in spite of their mutual difference as regards the position of a word in a sentence, the अन्विताभिधानवादिन्s and the वैयाकरण्s seem to hold that *a sentence is the unit of language*, and both of them recommend *the usage of elders or the actual use of a language as a superior way of teaching the meanings of words. This principle closely corresponds to the Direct Method of the West.*

As described above, a child subconsciously undergoes the detailed process of hearing, observation, inference, understanding the connected sense of individual words, and the establishment of

a direct bond between a word and an object, person, etc., in their due order; and this process being thoroughly *psychological* is in complete harmony with the modern psychology and linguistic principles. The child here learns a language without being conscious of the fact that it learns. According to the Western principles of language-study † a child possesses, in a high degree, *natural or spontaneous capacities* for acquiring speech. It is not only the mother tongue but other languages also (even a classical language) that can be learnt by means of the natural capacities for the imitation of elders and sub-conscious assimilation of language units. *Studial capacities* for learning languages are not natural but can be acquired by conscious practice, when a child is ripened in age and understanding. This is the reason why grammar, dictionaries, and commentaries can be used for learning a language only at the advanced stage. To make exclusive use of studial capacities in language-learning from the beginning is an unnatural process. Language-learning must, therefore, begin with the *use of natural capacities,* which may, at the advanced stage, be *supplemented by studial capacities.* The studial capacities then make it possible for the teacher to lay down a *corrective* course for eradicating bad habits of speech and writing and for developing good ones. It will thus be found that the Eastern and Western thinkers are at one in laying due *stress on the*

---

† Read 'The Principles of Language–Study' by H. E. Palmer.

usage of elders, and that the actual use of language in its association with objects, persons, etc., was *recognized long ago by the Eastern thinkers* as an effective means of language-learning. For this reason the Direct Method of teaching Sanskrit to young pupils should not be regarded as an innovation, and the efficacy of teaching new Sanskrit words in the context of connected Sanskrit sentences need not be doubted.

Now the प्राभाकरमीमांसकंs hold that *a verb is the principal word in a sentence* and that the remaining words in the sentence possess a meaning only in relation to the action (क्रिया) denoted by the verb; in other words, the remaining words have a कारक-relation to the verb. Then the construed meaning of the sentence not being something different from the expressed meanings of several constituent words, there is no necessity of postulating a separate function called तात्पर्य as has been done by the अभिहितान्वयवादिन्s. They, moreover, say that the usage of elders being mostly concerned with injunctions or something to be done (कार्य), only those sentences which contain commands (विधिपर, कार्यपर), i. e., sentences like 'गामानय', 'अश्वं बधान' containing verbs in लोट् (imperative), लिङ् (potential), etc., can convey a legitimate meaning; while the assertive sentences which are mere statements of fact (सिद्धवाक्यs) or which do not signify something to be done are अर्थवादs and cannot convey any meaning independently of a विधिवाक्य. This view is, according

to the नैयायिकs and वेदान्तिन्s, not correct. For, even सिद्धवाक्यs like 'चैत्र, पुत्रस्ते जातः' (Oh चैत्र, a son has been born to you), 'कन्या ते गर्भिणी जाता' (Your unmarried daughter has conceived) are independent and significant enough in gladdening or saddening the person addressed. Leaving aside the implications of these divergent views of the मीमांसकs and वेदान्तिन्s, we can derive from this a linguistic principle that connected sentences used in conversational lessons based on वृद्धव्यवहार can be in any mood, indicative, imperative or potential, and can equally convey independent meanings. Again, as assertive sentences (सिद्धवाक्यs) like 'काञ्च्यां त्रिभुवनतिलको भूपतिः', 'त्रयः कालाः' etc., are significant enough in the absence of verbs, sentences without verbs can also be used in conversational lessons without loss of meaning.

Again, the प्राभाकरमीमांसकs say that every sentence is composed of two portions (अंश). Of them the first portion is the constituent words and the second is their mutual relation which is called 'construction' (अन्वय, संसर्ग). It is, therefore, as much necessary to understand the signification or power (शक्ति) of the portion of अन्वय, as that of the portion of constituent words. For, if we shall understand simply the signification (शक्ति) of individual words, then we shall be at a loss to understand their mutual relation. It is, therefore, essential to comprehend the signification of the portion of relation (अन्वयांश) also.

But the नैयायिकs along with the भाट्टमीमांसकs take a different view of the matter. It is somewhat true, they say, that according to the usage of elders a child begins to learn the meanings of individual words through the connected sense of a sentence, and that the context of a sentence often helps us to understand the meaning of a word. Yet during the further stages of the learning process the child is able to understand the signification of a word in isolation or bereft of its relation to a sentence. According as he advances in understanding, he comes to know that single words exist independently in language and their meanings can be known from dictionaries, reliable persons (आप्त) etc. If it is supposed, say the नैयायिकs and the भाट्टमीमांसकs, that there are no independent words having separate meanings in language, we shall not be able to classify them into different parts of speech. Again, while reading a book or hearing a speech, sentences become unintelligible, if individual words in them are not known. The meanings of sentences are thoroughly understood only when the definite meanings of difficult words in them are known from a dictionary, though the general meanings of words in dictionaries are modified a little in the context of sentences in a book. Even our former knowledge of *individual* words helps us to understand any new matter. Again, for supplying explanations, oral or written (commentaries), particular words or phrases are selected more than others, although their general senses are to be made

specific to suit the context. Similarly etymological explanations are supplied only in the case of detached words and not in the case of a sentence. All these instances show that words are taken by us to have general, unconnected senses. It is then the individual senses of separate words in language that must first be expressed (अभिहित) and known; and then their construction or combination (अन्वय) into a sentence would be intelligible. Thus the theory advocating the synthesis (अन्वय) of the senses of unconnected words in the form of a sentence is called अभिहितान्वयवाद* (connection of the expressed), and the भाट्टमीमांसकs as well as the नैयायिकs who uphold it are designated as अभिहितान्वयवादिन्s.

According to the अभिहितान्वयवादिन्s, then, detached words in language possess individual meanings, which are conveyed by the वृत्तिs (functions of words) called अभिधा (Expression) and लक्षणा (Implication). Yet, if several independent words like 'गौरश्वः पुरुषो हस्ती' are merely put together without any relation (अन्वय), they do not convey anything beyond denoting the meaning of each individual word. As soon as each of these words is uttered or read, its expressive power (शक्ति) after doing its work is exhausted and does not lead us further. As there is no mutual relation between the words 'गौरश्वः पुरुषो हस्ती', they do not convey any

---

* अभिहितानां पदार्थानां अर्थाभिधायिनां वा पदानामन्वय इति वादः ।

unified sense of a sentence. This unified sense in the form of a sentence arises, when the general meanings of detached words mutually bear a relation (अन्वय), which is established by Expectancy (आकाङ्क्षा), Consistency (योग्यता), and Contiguity (संनिधि), as formerly treated of at length. This new or additional sense, which results from the correlation of individual senses, is not only a totality of them, but something more than that totality. It then assumes a peculiar shape (विशेषवपुः) and is distinct from the individual senses of words (अपदार्थ).† The individual senses, which then become the constituents, are modified and subordinated to this principal sense of a sentence. The independent meanings of words thus becoming dependent are turned into relational ones and subserve the unified meaning, which is called the sense of a sentence (वाक्यार्थ) or the purport (तात्पर्यार्थ), and which is conveyed by a separate function called तात्पर्यवृत्ति. If, therefore, the correlation (संसर्ग, अन्वय) of *significant* words themselves is the connected sense of a sentence, and if that correlation can be automatically established by means of आकाङ्क्षा, योग्यता and संनिधि, it is sufficient for us, say the अभिहितान्वय-वादिन्s, simply to understand the signification (शक्ति) of constituent words, and it is unnecessary to

† आकाङ्क्षायोग्यतासंनिधिवशात्पदार्थानां समन्वये तात्पर्यार्थो विशेष-वपुरपदार्थोऽपि वाक्यार्थः समुल्लसतीत्यभिहितान्वयवादिनां मतम् ।

—काव्यप्रकाशः, २।६.

postulate a separate signification of the portion of 'relation' (अन्वयांश), as the अन्विताभिधानवादिन्s do.

It may here be remarked that the views of both the अन्विताभिधानवादिन्s and अभिहितान्वयवादिन्s, as detailed above, contain *partial truth*. Although neither of them is absolutely true or superior to the other, each of them is correct and useful from its own standpoint. If the aspect of the precedence of a sentence in language-learning is taken into account, the view of the अन्विताभिधानवादिन्s is much plausible. For, when a child begins to speak, it assimilates language and *thinks* in the form of a *connected sentence* rather than in that of disconnected words, though it may express itself in single words for want of sufficient vocabulary. In order to encourage and develop this natural capacity of a child to assimilate language, the teacher will have to resort to the view of the अन्विताभिधानवादिन्s, who lay more stress on the aspect of a connected sentence than on that of words. This is how *the conversational method of teaching Sanskrit at the beginner's stage finds full support in the theory of the* अन्विताभिधानवादिन्s. But the theory of the अन्विता-भिधानवादिन्s does not seem to be absolutely true, when the aspect of the independent existence of significant words (पद) in language, as shown by the अभिहितान्वयवादिन्s, is taken into consideration. There is some truth in the view of the अभिहितान्वयवादिन्s also. For, when the pupils reach the advanced stage of language-learning, they begin to realize

that words in language exist apart from their context of a sentence also, and they learn their individual meanings from different sources like dictionaries, oral explanations, written explanations (commentaries) and others. It will thus be found that *the principle of* अभिहितान्वय *is useful particularly at the advanced stage of language-learning*, and that the conversational method, based on the relatively correct principle of अन्विताभिधान, has its own limitations, though it is at the beginning the natural method calculated to create a proper attitude towards Sanskrit. At the advanced stage too when the context of a connected sentence determines the meaning of a particular word in it, the principle of अन्विताभिधान is occasionally useful. But the principle of अभिहितान्वय, that detached words are unified into the special sense of a sentence by the process of construing (अन्वय), is more useful at the advanced stage than that of अन्विताभिधान, since the pupils by that time are able to recognize different parts of speech as well as their distinction from a sentence (unified sense), and are expected to have developed their studial capacity for consciously learning isolated forms of words through grammar (व्याकरण), dictionaries (कोश), commentaries (विवृति), etc.

Though the अन्विताभिधानवादिन्‌s and the अभिहितान्वयवादिन्‌s differ from each other as regards their approach to language, they are at one in recognizing the principle of अन्वय. As the अन्विताभिधानवादिन्‌s, however, say that a sentence expresses itself only

in its *construed* (अन्वित) form, they are not required to resort to the separate process of correlation or construing (अन्वय) of different words into a sentence as the अभिहितान्वयवादिन्s do. The process of construing, specially advocated by the अभिहितान्वयवादिन्s, further develops into the two distinct modes of दण्डान्वय and खण्डान्वय, which have been formerly dealt with in detail. Since those two methods of construing (दण्डान्वय and खण्डान्वय) have received the form of a permanent record in the *Sanskrit* commentaries on Sanskrit classics, their oral use in actual teaching must have long preceded the commentary literature and must have been current in ancient times. It may thus be said that the methods of दण्डान्वय and खण्डान्वय are based more on the linguistic theory of अभिहितान्वय than on that of अन्विताभिधान.

In contrast with the अखण्डवाक्यार्थवादिन्s (स्फोटवादिन्s) the मीमांसकs and the नैयायिकs are 'खण्डवाक्यार्थवादिन्s'; for, according to them a sentence is capable of being resolved into several parts. Of these खण्ड-वाक्यार्थवादिन्s, the अभिहितान्वयवादिन्s (भाट्टमीमांसकs and नैयायिकs) say that separate words, which form a sentence, can be construed and re-arranged in their proper order for the easy understanding of their connected meaning. So the views of the अभिहितान्वयवादिन्s seem to have played a prominent part in the development of the methods of दण्डान्वय and खण्डान्वय. As the नैयायिकs hold the 'subject' to be the principal word in a sentence, the method of

दण्डान्वय is akin to their process of understanding the meaning of a sentence.$ On the other hand, though the मीमांसकs in general take the verbal form to be the main word in a sentence,$ the views of the भाट्टमीमांसकs (अभिहितान्वयवादिन्s) might have particularly led to give a fixed and organized form to the method of खण्डान्वय, since only the भाट्टs are found to recognize the existence of single (detached) words and their construing. Against these खण्डवाक्यार्थवादिन्s there are the स्फोटवादिन्s who are called 'अखण्डवाक्यार्थवादिन्s,' because according to them a sentence is an indivisible whole. According to their view there is no scope for the construing of words, as a sentence cannot be divided into parts. They again think that only the indivisible वाक्यस्फोट is real, and that the disintegration (अपोद्धार) of a sentence into words, or of words into crude forms (प्रकृति) and affixes (प्रत्यय) is an unreal process resorted to for the understanding of unintelligent people. If they are thus found to adopt, against their main tenet, the imaginary process of analysis for the sake of children, there is no reason why, according to them, even the imaginary process of synthesis or construing (अन्वय) should not be adopted. The वैयाकरणs may, therefore, be taken in this particular

$ For instance, the नैयायिकs understand the sentence 'देवदत्तस्तण्डुलं पचति' as 'तण्डुलकर्मक-पाकानुकूलकृत्याश्रयो देवदत्तः' and the मीमांसकs understand the same as 'देवदत्तकर्तृक-तण्डुल-कर्मक-पाकक्रिया.'

sense to be favourable to the methods of construing, which facilitate understanding. Thus the recognition of significant and separate words in language and their combination into a sentence by the process of खण्डान्वय and दण्डान्वय for the purpose of expressing an additional sense or purport (तात्पर्य) are both of them *an analytico-synthetic process* adopted by the अभिहितान्वयवादिन्s.

It will then be found that the views of the अन्विताभिधानवादिन्s as well as of the अभिहितान्वयवादिन्s are relatively true, and that *the parts of truth contained in both of them can be amalgamated for fixing a graded course in language-teaching*. As indicated above, the view of the अन्विताभिधानवादिन्s sanctions, according to the usage of elders (वृद्धव्यवहार), the conversational or oral method, which is to be adopted particularly at the initial stage of teaching Sanskrit; while the view of the अभिहितान्वयवादिन्s, who lay down the principles and methods of construing, will be of great help in teaching at the advanced stage, when the pupils have learnt to read and write that language. It has already been seen that the natural capacities, which can be utilized in the *oral* teaching of language, do not suffice when boys begin to *read* and *write*. Reading, writing (dictation, composition, translation, etc.), analysis, synthesis, conjugation and declension require studial capacities, which can be developed by making use of intelligence, *eyes* and hands in addition to *ears*. At

the first stage, therefore, sufficient scope for *hearing, imitating* and *reproducing* language, all of which require natural capacities for assimilation, may be given; yet *these natural capacities must be gradually assisted by studial capacities, if an all-round course in language-teaching, following the linguistic principles of 'Gradation', 'Proportion', 'Rational Order of Progression' and 'Multiple Line of Approach',* is to be prepared.* The methods of दण्डान्वय and खण्डान्वय, which require the use of studial capacities, are expected to give a finished and graded form to the Sanskrit course. It has formerly been shown in detail that the method of खण्डान्वय, which is based on the principles of अभिहितान्वयवाद, is far superior to that of दण्डान्वय, since it is a psychological method making a prominent use of questions and answers. Question-and-answer work being an important feature of the Conversational or Direct Method, the method of खण्डान्वय has been found to bear much resemblance to it. Thus *the oral use of the method of खण्डान्वय for teaching Sanskrit at the advanced stage will be a natural growth of the Conversational Method, which is based on the वृद्धव्यवहार of the अन्विताभिधानवादिन्s and which is to be utilized at the elementary stage. This combination (समुच्चय) of the theories of अन्विताभिधान and अभिहितान्वय is calculated to prove very beneficial to the practice of Sanskrit teaching,* which will thus be based on the Eastern

*Read 'The Principles of Language-Study,' by H. E. Palmer.

linguistic principles gradually evolved from the peculiar nature and structure of Sanskrit language. Moreover, the Eastern linguistic principles and methods finding their parallels in those of the West, will stand the test of the modern scientific methods of language-teaching. It may be remarked in passing that the above combination (समुच्चय) of अन्विताभिधान and अभिहितान्वय is not an innovation; for such समुच्चयवादिन्s, as referred to by 'मुकुल' in his 'अभिधावृत्ति-मातृका', seem to have already existed in ancient times. †

XIII. EXPRESSION (अभिधा).

It will now be opportune to see how the अभिहितान्वयवादिन्s, after accepting the independent existence of words in language, explain their individual significance. Among them the नैयायिकs, while dealing with the *psychological process* of the comprehension of words, say that mere words in language are not the cause of verbal comprehension. In the first place, the perception of a word must take place; i. e., a word spoken or written must be

† अन्येषां तु मते पदानां तत्तत्सामान्यभूतो वाच्योऽर्थः । वाक्यस्य तु परस्परान्विताः पदार्था इति पदापेक्षयाभिहितान्वयः, वाक्यापेक्षया त्वन्विताभिधानम् । एवं चैतयोरभिहितान्वयान्विताभिधानयोः समुच्चय इति ॥

— अभिधावृत्तिमातृका, कारिका ७,८

actually heard or read. Secondly, we must possess the knowledge of शक्ति or the inherent power of a word to facilitate the memory of a certain meaning *; i. e., we must be aware of the convention (सङ्केत) that such and such a word should denote such and such a meaning.† Thirdly, this knowledge of शक्ति or सङ्केत leads, through the association of words, to the recollection of meaning in relation to objects. Now *the law of mental association* is that if one out of two related things is seen, it naturally reminds us of the other thing related to it.$ For example, if a man knows the relation of 'the served and the servant' (सेव्यसेवकसम्बन्ध) between an elephant and an elephant-driver respectively, he will be reminded of the other, in case he comes in sight of one of them. As in the present case a word and its meaning are two related things, the knowledge of the power (शक्ति) of a word immediately reminds us of its meaning, which is related to an object. This recollection of meaning by association takes place through 'वृत्ति' or significatory function, which is a conventional relation between a word and an object (the idea of an object, i. e., the meaning) signified by it. For instance, if the word 'घट' (jar) is known, it awakens, when uttered, the memory of the object 'घट' (i. e. the meaning) through the conventional

---

* अर्थस्मृत्यनुकूलः पदपदार्थसम्बन्धः शक्तिः । (तर्कदीपिका).

† अस्मात्पदादयमर्थो बोद्धव्य इतीश्वरसङ्केतः शक्तिः । (तर्कसङ्ग्रहः).

$ एकसम्बन्धिज्ञानमपरसम्बन्धिस्मारकमिति न्यायात् ।

relation (वृत्ति) established between the word 'घट' and the object 'घट'. In short, the instrument of verbal comprehension is the knowledge of a word, the intermediate mental action in it is the recollection of the sense (the idea of an object) of that word, its auxiliary *is the knowledge of the denotative power of a* word, and the result is the verbal knowledge in relation to an object.* Now the relation (वृत्ति) of a word to its meaning is, according to the नैयायिकs, of two kinds, viz., शक्ति or अभिधा (Expression) and लक्षणा (Implication); while according to the आलङ्कारिकs it is of three kinds, viz, अभिधा, लक्षणा and व्यञ्जना (Suggestion). Of these the direct or conventional relation between a word and its meaning leading to the immediate comprehension of the *primary* sense is called 'शक्ति' or 'अभिधा'. For example, the word 'घट' directly expresses a particular object with a shape having a large bottom, body, etc.† Hence this *direct relation* between the word 'घट' and the object signified by it is called शक्ति, सङ्केत or अभिधा. Since the meaning of a word is contained in its *relation* to the object signified, the meaning recollected by the help of शक्ति (inherent power) being primary (मुख्य) is termed 'शक्य' (what is denoted by शक्ति) or 'वाच्य' (the expressed), and the word

---

* पदज्ञानं तु करणं द्वारं तत्र पदार्थधीः । शाब्दबोधः फलं तत्र शक्तिधीः सहकारिणी ॥ —भाषापरिच्छेदः, ८१

† शक्तिर्नाम पदानामर्थेषु मुख्या वृत्तिः । यथा घटपदस्य पृथुबुध्नोदराद्याकृतिविशिष्टे वस्तुविशेषे वृत्तिः । (वेदान्तपरिभाषा, ४).

having such a meaning is designated as 'शक्त' (having the power to express) or 'वाचक' (expressive).

There are divergent views among the Hindu schools of thought about the question whether the वृत्ति called 'शक्ति' or 'अभिधा', i. e., the power or convention (सङ्केत) of a word, is concerned with a class (जाति) or an individual (व्यक्ति). The नव्यनैयायिकs and साङ्ख्यs, who are 'केवलव्यक्तिवादिन्s', think that the convention of a word should be understood with reference to an individual (व्यक्ति), since it is the individual (a concrete substance or form) alone that can become the object of sense-perception (sound, touch, colour, taste and smell) and practical activity, and not the class or genus (जाति). For, when we say 'गामानय', we refer to the individual 'गौः' (cow) and not to 'गोत्व' (cowness) as 'गोत्व' cannot be the object of the practical activity of bringing, milking, etc. (अर्थक्रियाकारित्व). Similarly, in sentences like 'This is a flower', 'This is a book', etc., we do not refer to their class but to the individual.

The मीमांसकs object to this theory of individual denotation (केवलव्यक्तिवाद), and say that it is the genus (जाति) that is denoted by a word and not an individual. Firstly, if the convention of the word 'गौः' would be understood with respect to *all* individual cows, the fault of endlessness (आनन्त्य) would occur. As the individuals are numberless, it is impossible for us to understand the convention or power of the word 'गौः' with reference to *all* of them at

the same time. We shall, in that case, have to use as many different words as there are cows on the earth; and those words being distinct from one another, we shall have to understand the convention of each of those words separately. This is against our actual experience that one word should denote one primary sense. Thus the convention of a word cannot be understood with reference to *all* individuals. Secondly, if it is supposed that the convention of a word can be understood with regard to one individual or *some* individuals, the fault of violation (व्यभिचार) occurs. In other words, the rule that a word denotes that sense alone in regard to which a convention is known, is violated. For instance, if we shall understand the convention of the word 'गौः' with reference to 'a *white* cow' we shall not be able to understand the same convention with reference to 'a *black* cow' i. e., the black cow will have to be excluded from the said convention (सङ्केतविषय), just as a jar (घट) cannot be the object of that convention. This leads us to the fault of violation (व्यभिचार), which occurs when we understand the convention with respect to one individual or *some* individuals. The convention of the word 'गौः' is, however, usually understood by us with regard to *any* cow, white, black or tawny. In other words, we actually apply the word 'गौः' to a white as well as a black cow without distinction, though no special convention is made regarding the black cow. Thirdly, if we suppose that words denote individuals alone, the words

'गौः शुक्लश्चलो डित्थः' being used with respect to one and the same individual, would be synonymous; i. e., the scope of those words as nouns, adjectives, verbs, etc., not being distinct, the objects denoted by them would not be differentiated, and such synonymous words would not form a complete sentence. It must, therefore, be concluded, say the मीमांसकs, that the convention or power of a word must be understood in respect of the genus or class (जाति), which is the attribute (उपाधि) of an individual.† As the genus is the common property residing in similar individuals, it gives us a comprehensive knowledge of several things that possess this common property or attribute. The genus is, therefore, one eternal property among non-eternal things. What is then meant by the word 'गौः' is not the particular 'गौः' but the common attribute or property 'गोत्व' which resides in all cows. If it is objected that 'जाति' (गोत्व, घटत्व, etc.) cannot be brought for practical purposes, but the individual 'गोव्यक्ति' can be brought, the मीमांसकs say that the individual (व्यक्ति) can be understood by implication (आक्षेप, लक्षणा), as the individual is inseparably connected with its class (जाति). According to the मीमांसकs, therefore, it is the genus or class (जाति) that is

---

† यद्यप्यर्थक्रियाकारितया प्रवृत्तिनिवृत्तियोग्या व्यक्तिरेव, तथाप्यानन्त्याद्व्यभिचाराच्च तत्र सङ्केतः कर्तुं न युज्यत इति, गौः शुक्लश्चलो डित्थ इत्यादीनां शब्दानां विषयविभागो न प्राप्नोतीति तदुपाधावेव सङ्केतः।

—काव्यप्रकाशः, उ. २.

primarily understood by the convention of a word, the individual being known *secondarily* (लक्षणया). Thus the word 'गौः' primarily means 'गोत्व' (the common property 'cowness') and secondarily the individual 'गौः' (cow).

The मीमांसकs and the वैयाकरणs agree in holding the view that convention can be understood with reference to the genus (जाति) which is an attribute (उपाधि) of an individual, though they differ as regards the number of उपाधिs. The मीमांसकs, who are केवलजातिवादिन्s, regard mere जाति as the attribute of an individual, in respect of which (जाति) the convention of a word is established; while the वैयाकरणs, who are जात्यादिवादिन्s, say that the convention of a word is to be understood with regard to the four attributes of an individual, viz., जाति, गुण, क्रिया and संज्ञा or यदृच्छा, as words in language can be divided into four groups.§ Again, while discussing whether the sense of a word is जाति (आकृति) or व्यक्ति (द्रव्य) पतञ्जलि says on the basis of पाणिनि's सूत्रs that the sense of a word is both जाति and व्यक्ति.$ Out of the four attributes mentioned above 'जाति' (genus) is an attribute which being inherent in a thing gives life to it. For

§ चतुष्टयी शब्दानां प्रवृत्तिः। जातिशब्दाः गुणशब्दाः क्रियाशब्दा यदृच्छाशब्दाश्चतुर्थाः। पातं. महाभाष्यम्, आ. २, सूत्र २.

$ किं पुनराकृतिः पदार्थ आहोस्विद् द्रव्यम्। उभयमित्याह। कथं ज्ञायते। उभयथा ह्याचार्येण सूत्राणि पठितानि। पा. म. भाष्यम्, आ. १.

instance, the cowness (गोत्व) in a cow (गौः) is the very essence which can never be separated from 'गौः' and which distinguishes गोजाति from other animals. All common nouns in language are thus indicative of this common attribute 'genus' (जाति). The second attribute, according to the वैयाकरणs, is a quality (गुण), which distinguishes a thing from others of the same class. A quality like 'white' or 'black' can be separated from a class like 'a garment' in which it resides; and all the words showing such a quality are adjectives. The third attribute 'क्रिया' consists of *a series of actions*, which are prior and posterior, and which occupy successive portions of time. For instance, the main action of cooking rice consists of several successive actions, viz., the taking of rice in a winnowing basket, its winnowing, its putting into a pot with water, the placing of the pot on the fireplace, boiling, and lastly the taking of the pot from the fireplace. All verbs in language denote this क्रिया or a *series of actions*. F. Gouin in his 'Art of Teaching and Studying Languages' has invented the 'linguistic series' on the basis of such series of actions. He has included several subordinate actions under one main action and prepared his linguistic series for the purpose of teaching any language by the Conversational Method. Occasional use of such *linguistic series of actions* may also be made while teaching Sanskrit by the Conversational Method. Fourthly, संज्ञा or यदृच्छा is an attribute which is imposed upon

a person or a thing by the will of the speaker, and which is, therefore, called a proper noun. The आलङ्कारिकs, from a practical point of view favour this view of the वैयाकरणs for the purpose of signifying the manifold function of words.

The ancient नैयायिकs assume a different position as regards the import of words. They say that a word does not denote an individual (व्यक्ति) alone, as the faults of आनन्त्य and व्यभिचार occur in that case. Again, a word does not signify only the genus (जाति), since it is, for instance, the individual 'गौः' that is related to the primary meaning of a word as well as to the practical activity of 'bringing', 'milking', etc., and since it is absurd to bring the genus 'cowness' (गोत्व). Thus, after rejecting the extreme views of the केवलव्यक्तिवादिन्s and the केवलजातिवादिन्s the ancient नैयायिकs strike a golden mean and further say that the word 'गौः' indicates all the three factors, viz., व्यक्ति, जाति and आकृति at the same time. In other words, a word *denotes* an individual, *connotes* the genus or class of similar individuals, and distinguishes the individual from other dissimilar individuals by its peculiar form or configuration. Now the form or configuration of an individual is the arrangement or conjunction of its constituent parts or limbs in a particular way; and this peculiar configuration being the common property of similar individuals leads us to the idea of the genus. Thus the word 'गौः' denotes the individual 'गौः', distinguishes the 'गौः' from other animals owing to

her peculiar form 'सास्नादिमत्त्व' (possession of dewlap, etc.), and connotes the genus 'गोत्व' (cowness) on account of the possession of the common property 'सास्नादिमत्त्व'. What the नैयायिक्स mean is that a word refers to an individual as characterized by its class or genus (जातिविशिष्टव्यक्ति) or to an individual as distinguished by its class and configuration (जात्याकृतिविशिष्टव्यक्ति). The word 'गौः' then denotes the individual 'गौः' as qualified by गोत्वजाति, which is in intimate union with the concrete गोव्यक्ति. If a word thus refers to an individual and its peculiar form or shape, it cannot be said that it signifies the genus alone, as the मीमांसक्स assert. For, a class or genus can be apprehended only through the individuals forming it and through their form or shape. It must, therefore, be said that व्यक्ति, आकृति and जाति are the three factors, which are present in the sense of every word, and which taken together give us the full meaning of that word. Although all these factors are present in the sense of a word, yet the motive or interest shown by the speaker in a particular factor or aspect gives more or less prominence to that factor. If we say, 'This is a cow', we give prominence to the individual aspect; if we say 'This cow is possessed of the dewlap, hump, etc.,' we lay stress on her form, and if we say "A cow is called 'a cow' because of her intimate relation to cowness", we emphasize the class-notion or genus. It may be remarked here that the form or shape of an individual not being

apart from its class, the आकृति may be included in जाति, and that the view of the old नैयायिकs that a word denotes an individual as distinguished by its class or genus (जातिविशिष्टव्यक्ति) may be held as representative.

Against all these views about the import of words the बौद्धs say that a word indicates neither व्यक्ति nor जाति, since व्यक्ति, जाति, etc., being simply the conceptions of our mind imposed upon the so-called external things, are momentary and unreal. They, therefore, uphold the principle of अपोह or अतद्व्यावृत्ति (distinction or exclusion of a thing from what it is *not*), and say that a word like 'घट' indicates a thing, which possesses peculiarities distinguishing it from all other things like पट, गौः, etc. Thus by saying that 'घट' is not 'पट' they hold that the import of words is of a negative nature.

Now the अद्वैतवेदान्तिन्s hold from the absolute (पारमार्थिक) point of view that the word is an illusory form (विवर्त) of the Absolute ब्रह्मन् and that the distinctions of व्यक्ति and जाति are simply the conceptions of the mind. According to them, therefore, the most expressive word is that which after its own negation seeks to pass beyond all distinctions of व्यक्ति, जाति, etc., and helps one to merge in the all-pervading silence of the Absolute ब्रह्मन्, or which is instrumental in establishing the primal identity of the individual soul with the Universal Soul. Yet, in order to help the individual soul to reach that

Absolute State by easy and graded steps, they resort to the phenomenal reality (व्यावहारिकसत्ता), and in alliance with the मीमांसकs they try to reconcile the above conflicting views. Along with the मीमांसकs they then think that शक्ति (power or significance) is an independent category, and that the thing which becomes an object of this power (शक्ति) is called 'शक्य' (what is capable of direct signification). Again, like the मीमांसकs they say that the शक्यत्व (capacity of being directly signified) belongs to the genus and not to the individual. With the same view शङ्कराचार्य says that words are related to the eternal genus (आकृति=जाति) and not to the non-eternal individuals.† According to the Vedant there is identity between an attribute (धर्म) and the thing possessing that attribute (धर्मिन्), i. e., between जाति and व्यक्ति respectively. The same cognition, therefore, that can cognize the genus (जाति) can also cognize the individuals.§ The वेदान्तिन्s further express a reasonable view that the foregoing independent power (शक्ति) of a word resides in an individual (व्यक्ति) as well as in a genus (जाति), though in different degrees. In an individual it remains, by its mere existence (स्वरूपसती), latent or unknown; while in a genus it is

† आकृतिभिश्च शब्दानां सम्बन्धो न व्यक्तिभिः। ब्र. सू. भा. १·३·२८

§ कथं तर्हि गवादिपदाद् व्यक्तिभानमिति चेत्, जातेर्व्यक्तिसमानसंवित्संवेद्यत्वादिति ब्रूमः। –वेदान्तपरिभाषा, प्र. ४.

express or known.$ For the cognition of the genus the power or significance *as known* is necessary, while for the cognition of an individual it is unnecessary that the power should be known. It is sufficient that the power exists in the individual in a *latent* form. When from the word 'गौः' we have to cognize गोत्वजाति, we are required to know the power residing in गोत्वजाति; but for the cognition of गोव्यक्ति we are not required separately to know the power in गोव्यक्ति, if the same power is latently existent there. For, the word 'गौः' itself can give us the idea of गोव्यक्ति through गोत्वजातिं. As soon as the cognition of जाति arises in us after the knowledge of the power in जाति, the same power that latently exists in व्यक्ति can lead us immediately to the cognition of व्यक्ति. In other words, if after hearing a word we have cognized the genus through its express power (ज्ञातंशक्ति), we can without delay cognize the individual which is inseparable from the genus, even though we have no knowledge of the power residing in the individual.† For this reason, the individual has no capacity of being directly signified (शक्यत्व, वाच्यत्व), though the power (शक्ति) exists in it. On the other hand, the genus alone has the capacity of direct signification, since it is the genus,

$ यद्वा गवादिपदानां व्यक्तौ शक्तिः स्वरूपसती, न तु ज्ञाता; जातौ तु सा ज्ञाता हेतुः । —वेदान्तपरिभाषा, प्र. ४.

† जातिशक्तिमत्त्वज्ञाने सति व्यक्तिशक्तिमत्त्वज्ञानं विना व्यक्तिधीविलम्बाभावाच्च । —वेदान्तपरिभाषा, प्र. ४.

and not the individual, that becomes the object of शक्ति *as known,* and only that which is an object of शक्ति as known is capable of direct signification (शक्य, वाच्य). § This, in short, means that a word primarily signifies जाति and secondarily व्यक्ति.

Thus there are five conflicting views propounded by the Indian schools of thought regarding the import of words. Now in the terminology of Western Logic words are *denotative* according to to the केवलव्यक्तिवादिन्s, *connotative* according to the केवलजातिवादिन्s, both *denotative and connotative* according to the जातिविशिष्टव्यक्तिवादिन्s, and the जात्यादिवादिन्s and *neither denotative nor connotative* according to the अपोहवादिन्s. Every view contains a a grain of truth and none can be wholly rejected, since the function of language is to indicate the individual aspect as well as the class-aspect of a word. The problem then rests on what aspect gives us the *direct* signification of words; and it is preferable, on the whole, to say that the aspect of genus or class has the capacity of direct signification. Words in language are by nature never perfectly expressive of the internal meaning; but there are higher and lower degrees of perfect expression in the use of words. It may, therefore, be said that the aspect of genus contains a higher degree of perfect expression.

---

§ ज्ञायमानशक्तिविषयत्वमेव वाच्यत्वमिति जातिरेव वाच्या । अथवा व्यक्तेर्लक्षणयाऽवगमः । —वेदान्तपरिभाषा, प्र. ४.

From the standpoint of *Western psychology* it will be seen that the केवलव्यक्तिवादिन्s stress the *perceptual aspect* of words, the केवलजातिवादिन्s emphasize the *conceptual aspect*, and the जात्यादिवादिन्s and जातिविशिष्टव्यक्तिवादिन्s attend both to the *perceptual and conceptual aspects*. 'Perception' is concerned with concrete objects or things affecting the five sense-organs; yet the object of perception, which is the result of sensations caused in the mind by an external object, is not the actual object in the external world; it is the 'psychical object', which is supplied by the mind itself in order to help the interpretation of the unity of our sensations, and which is, therefore, more directly present in our consciousness than the external object. This psychical object being a sign or symbol of the outer object is different from the latter. It, therefore, partakes of the aspects of an individual as well as a class or genus, or of the particular as well as the general at the same time. Or, it may be said from another point of view that the psychical object is neither particular nor general, as it is detached both from the external object and the 'Concept'. This double and dubious character of the psychical object accounts for the divergence of views held by the Indian schools of thought about the import of words. This is the reason why the केवलव्यक्तिवादिन्s stress the individual aspect of words, the जात्यादिवादिन्s and the जातिविशिष्टव्यक्तिवादिन्s take into account the aspects of both the individual and the class, and the अपोहवादिन्s deny the existence of व्यक्ति and जाति.

This *psychical object,* which is aroused in the mind itself by our present and past experiences, supplies us, in relation to the external object, with a 'meaning'. Our mind has a natural tendency to find out a *relation* between two or more things mentally presented to it The *relation* thus established *between the psychical object and the actual object* by our present or past experiences contributes to the *meaning,* which arises in the mind itself rather than in the outer object, and which also depends on the relations formerly established in the mind. In order to denote this meaning words in language are conventionally used as symbols or signs; and the meaning remains individual, concrete and incomplete until the psychical object has assumed a definite form of the class-aspect; i. e., words used to denote merely objects in perception cannot convey their full significance unless they have widened their scope by the help of the *generic aspect in conceptual thinking.* This is why there is much truth in the view of the केवलजातिवादिन्s.

When, therefore, the class-aspect of words becomes definite in the mind by the transformation of a 'percept' into a 'concept' or a general idea, the *meaning* in our mind assumes a complete form. The *concept* is formed in us by the analytico-synthetic process of the *observation* of several individuals, *analysis* of their attributes, *comparison* for finding out their similarities and differences, *abstraction* of similarities from differences, *synthesis* of common properties or attri-

butes, and the *use of names* or *linguistic symbols* for fixing the unified idea in the mind. The unified idea itself contains a full meaning, for indicating which verbal symbols or words in language are used as in the case of the perceptual or individual objects. The unified idea formed by the analytico-synthetic process is the *concept*, pattern or schema of similar individual objects in the world, and it being a developed form of the 'psychical object' enables us to interpret comprehensively several individuals so as to obtain a general meaning. The concepts or patterns in our mind being separated from the concrete and particular objects in the perceptual world are of a general and abstract nature. They, therefore, give us a comprehensive knowledge of things by including many particular individuals in a general category; and the more such concepts or patterns are stored in our mind, the more we develop our power of understanding the universe. Here we understand the propriety of the view of the केवलजातिवादिन्s that the power (शक्ति) of a word is primarily understood in जाति and secondarily in व्यक्ति. Human mind has been, from generation to generation, so accustomed to the above patterns that the power of conceptual thinking is, as in the case of the concepts of time and space, inborn in us along with our power of the perception of individual objects.

It may, however, be said that our thinking is never purely perceptual, but it is both perceptual and conceptual from our childhood. Although the

psychical object in us partakes of a tinge of abstraction on account of its isolation from the actual object, yet the concrete and individual aspect seems to be prominent in it. It is, therefore, true that our thinking in childhood is more perceptual than conceptual, though we find from the behaviour and speech of children that generic images, which are based more on similarities than on difference of objects, are gradually being formed in them, leading them slowly to the conceptual level. Though children use words to express generic images of things, yet they are not fully conscious of the class-aspect of those words, as they learn their use mostly by the imitation of elders (वृद्धव्यवहार). The use of words by children is, therefore, denotative rather than connotative; and here we realize the importance of the theories of जात्यादिवादिन्s and जातिविशिष्टव्यक्तिवादिन्s. The process of perceptual and conceptual thinking thus goes on alternately throughout the whole life, and we have correspondingly to attend to the individual as well as the generic aspect of words in the use of language. Thus *words*, which are, as indicated above, the external *linguistic signs or symbols* of inner ideas, perceptual or conceptual, help us to recall them in our minds and carry on our daily affairs by means of the *communication* of those ideas. Language, therefore, not only aids, records and preserves our thought, but assists us in our *communication*, which may be known to be its chief function, particularly in language-teaching.

The teaching of a new language to children should accordingly be based on both the aspects mentioned above, though the individual and concrete aspect of words depending on perceptual thinking would occupy a prominent position in their case. Language-teaching in childhood will thus be fruitful, if we shall gradually start from the perceptual to the conceptual level. In other words, gestures, pictures, diagrams, etc., will be used in association with spoken words. Here the common truth contained in the views of जात्यादिवादिन्s and जातिविशिष्टव्यक्तिवादिन्s will be amalgamated in the interest of young pupils, after taking into account the aspects of जाति (genus), व्यक्ति (individual), and आकृति (concrete form of objects.)

An important point must be noted here that although the मीमांसक्s in general recognize the theory of class-connotation of words (केवलजातिवाद), yet the अन्विताभिधानवादिन्s among them, who hold that a sentence is the unit of language, recommend the usage of elders (वृद्धव्यवहार) and the learning of individual words through the context of a sentence as a superior way of learning language. In the usage of elders and in the imitation of it by children the perceptual (individual) aspect of words seems to be more prominent than the conceptual (generic) aspect, which is the mainstay of the theory of केवलजातिवाद. How is this contradiction in the views of the अन्विताभिधानवादिन्s to be removed? The answer is that the conceptual aspect of words is not

altogether absent in the minds of children and that it is gradually developed in them through the mental process of *inclusion and exclusion* or the *analytico-synthetic* process (अन्वयव्यतिरेक) as formerly treated of. The pupils, therefore, by the time they begin to learn a new language like Sanskrit, have already their power of conceptual thinking more developed than that in childhood. Particularly, in the use of their mother tongue, at this stage, they are accustomed to be more conscious of the class-aspect of words than the individual one. In other words, they can, by the use of 'common nouns' in the mother tongue, understand individual objects or persons (व्यक्ति) secondarily through class-notions (जाति). Inasmuch as these class-notions exist in the minds of pupils at this stage and lead them still further to understand other class-notions, the theory of केवलजातिवाद् is correct. This theory can, therefore, be reconciled with the 'usage of elders' particularly at the stage of learning a new language like Sanskrit. It will then be found that while teaching individual words, at this stage, in the context of a connected sentence and in association with concrete things, the class-notion of those words is not to be newly formed by the teacher. The class-notion, being already existent in the minds of pupils, is simply to be awakened through concrete objects, pictures, etc., so as to establish *a direct bond between a new word and an idea* (*concept*). The pupils, while learning new words in association with concrete objects, do not also take particular

words to mean only the objects shown by the teacher, but understand them in the light of their class-notions of those objects. The class-aspect of words here *primarily* arises in their minds and the individual aspect *secondarily*. In other words, the same cognition of pupils that cognizes the genus (जाति) also cognizes the individual (व्यक्ति). When the words in an unknown language are being newly introduced in association with objects, it is the class-aspect of words present in the minds of pupils that instantly suggests the corresponding words in the mother tongue to them as a result of mental translation; and those known words are sometimes impatiently given out by them. The theory of केवल-जातिवाद in alliance with वृद्धव्यवहार is thus found to be consistent particularly at the pupil's stage of learning a language other than the mother tongue.

One would ask here why words in the mother tongue should not be brought into relation with new words in an unknown language by the process of 'translation', when the pupils have thus reached the conceptual level. The answer is that the *process of translation* is purely conceptual and results in the tedium and disgust of young pupils, in whose case the perceptual aspect of teaching is beneficial. Translation may, of course, be resorted to in the case of abstract words, as the next direct way of introducing them. But we must not forget that words in any language are dead things unless they are made alive by the concrete devices of gestures, intonation, objects, context, etc., in *oral*

teaching. Again, it is an obvious fact that while forming new concepts or learning an unknown subject the tendency of all human beings, young and old, is generally to think in terms of *concrete* things which symbolize those concepts and facilitate *clear understanding*. It need not be told how the use of concrete illustrations and symbolism makes an abstract and abstruse subject intelligible. Hence, while teaching a new language, concrete things like models, pictures, diagrams, etc., are calculated to serve the purpose of fixing, even in the minds of advanced students, the concepts already formed by them through their mother tongue; and they awaken the 'apperception masses' of pupils after bringing out the *relation* between 'a psychical object' and 'an actual object,' or between a concept and a concrete thing. In other words, they revive their memory and help the *direct communication* of the *meaning* of a word. As the relation (वृत्ति) between a new word and its meaning (पद and पदार्थ) is here *directly* established by immediately showing an object closely related to the meaning and by making the pupils briskly repeat that word in chorus and individually, very little chance is left for its mental translation by the pupils; and the new word being coloured and made alive by concrete life-situations can be well learnt and recollected owing to the association of ideas. This principle of the modern Direct or Conversational Method may, therefore, be advantageously followed at the elementary

and intermediate stages of teaching Sanskrit, since it, without being antagonistic, can be well reconciled with the above linguistic principles formulated by the Indian schools of thought, more particularly with the 'usage of elders' (वृद्धव्यवहार) sanctioned by the अन्विताभिधानवादिन्s. Just as the आलङ्कारिकs have in general tried to harmonize the views of the above Indian schools and specially followed the जात्यादिवादिन्s (वैयाकरणs) for the practical purpose of explaining the poetic function of words, we too have here tried to harmonize the Oriental and Western views for the purpose of their practical application to the teaching of Sanskrit words.

After discussing the problem as to *where the expressive power* (शक्ति) *of a word resides* and after dealing with *its practical implications*, we shall turn to the four kinds of शक्ति viz., योग, रूढि, योगरूढि and यौगिकरूढि, corresponding to which words are divided into four classes, viz., यौगिक, रूढ, योगरूढ and यौगिकरूढ, according to the different modes through which they yield their meanings. 'योग' means etymology, derivation or *the significance of the component parts of a word* (अवयवशक्ति). Here, of course, the meaning of a word is understood from its component parts; which are either a root or a noun and a prefix or a suffix. The यौगिक word does not signify anything more or less than the meanings of its parts, but yields, on the whole, only that meaning which is implied in the parts. For instance, the meaning of the word 'पाचक' is understood by

us as 'पाककर्ता' (a cook) from the root 'पच्' (to cook) and the कर्तरि suffix 'अक'. Secondly, 'रूढि' means the popular, conventional or customary significance of a word. In the case of a रूढ word the meaning is determined by *the power of the whole word* (समुदाय-शक्ति) without reference to the meanings of its parts. For instance, the word 'मण्डप' etymologically means 'one who protects scum' (मण्ड + प = मण्डं पातीति); but this meaning rarely occurs to us, since we conventionally understand the collective meaning of the whole word 'मण्डप' as 'an open hall'. The नैरुक्तs (etymologists) and the वैयाकरणs propound a theory that all nouns in language are derived from roots ('आख्यातजानि नामानि'–निरुक्त). But this is an extreme case, as the conventional meanings of रूढ words are seen to have acquired more significance than their root-meanings, which can rarely be traced in the former. Thirdly, a 'योगरूढ' or derivatively conventional word is that which yields its meaning through derivation or etymology (योग) as well as convention (रूढि). Here both the derivative meaning and the conventional meaning coincide with each other, as both of them *refer to the same object*. In other words, the meaning obtained from the component parts of a word is the same as that obtained collectively from the whole word. For example, the etymological meaning of the word 'पङ्कज', when it is derived from its component parts, is 'what grows in the mud' (पङ्क + ज = पङ्काज्जायते

इति). This meaning is joined through contiguity to the conventional or collective meaning of the whole word 'पङ्कज' which signifies 'a lotus'. Both these meanings referring to the same object agree with each other. It must be noted here that the conventional meaning is more proximate to the mind than the etymological one, as the former occurs to us instantly; while the etymological meaning occuring late to the mind is distant from us, as it is necessary for us to possess the knowledge of प्रकृति (crude form) and प्रत्यय (affix) before we undersand the root-meaning. Many Sanskrit words belong to this 'योगरूढ' type, since both the etymological and conventional meanings can be traced in them. There is, however, a linguistic rule in Sanskrit that convention or usage is more powerful than etymology (योगाद्रूढिर्बलीयसी). Lastly, a 'यौगिकरूढ' or derivative-and-conventional word is that, the meaning of which is ascertained either etymologically by the powers of its component parts or conventionally by the power of the whole. In this case both the meanings being determined independently of each other, both of them are understood separately. The word 'उद्भिद्', for example, etymologically means 'what shoots up or a tree' (उद् + भिद् = ऊर्ध्वं भिनत्तीति), while conventionally 'उद्भिद्' is a kind of sacrifice. Here the two independent meanings are understood from the same word, yet they *refer to separate objects.*

An important point to be noted is that 'रूढ' words always prevail over 'यौगिक' words as regards

the determination of meaning. The मीमांसक too while discussing the relative importance of the six modes of evidence (प्रमाण) in the treatment of 'injunctions of application' (विनियोगविधि) lay down a very sound principle of interpretation that 'लिङ्ग' or the word-meaning established by usage (रूढि) is a stronger mode of evidence than 'समाख्या' or name, the meaning in which is determined by योग (etymology). Thus in the matter of interpretation they attach more importance to the conventional meanings (रूढार्थ) of words than to the etymological ones (यौगिकार्थ). They further say that etymology is to be resorted to only when other more important means of interpretation are unavailable. This important linguistic principle is as much useful in language-teaching as it is in the interpretation of advanced Shastric works. Sanskrit teachers, who have up to this time been so fond of laying undue stress on the teaching of verbs so as to enable their pupils to derive Sanskrit words from their root-stems, will, it is hoped, note this principle and will kindly abstain from the predominantly etymological teaching of Sanskrit language and literature. They will bear in mind the fact that etymology is purely an analytical and tedious process of dissolving a unified word into a crude form (प्रकृति) and an affix (प्रत्यय). If this process is resorted to, particularly at the elementary and intermediate stages of Sanskrit teaching, pupils are left in the dark about the beauty of ideas and expression in Sanskrit

literature, and are bound to be scared away from the subject. To engage oneself simply in the etymological study of words bereft of their context of a sentence is a futile attempt. This does not, of course, mean that while teaching Sanskrit literature to advanced students, the etymology of a word or two should not be given here and there, if without marring the beauty of a passage it adds to the *purport* (synthetic meaning) of a sentence or a paragraph. Yet it is advisable for the sake of literary appreciation and interest of pupils to accept the conventional meanings of words as they are current in Sanskrit literature, and teach them in their proper context. The Sanskrit words, therefore, that are to be introduced according to 'वृद्धव्यवहार' at the beginner's stage, should all of them be concrete rather than abstract, and of conventional meanings (रूढार्थ) rather than of etymological ones (यौगिकार्थ).

XIV. PURPORT (तात्पर्य)

Thus the अभिहितान्वयवादिन्s, with whom even the नैयायिकs should be classed, after dealing with the detached meanings of words existing independently in language say that when *a relation* is established between the senses of such words in a sentence by means of आकाङ्क्षा, योग्यता and सन्निधि, a new meaning, which is not the meaning of indivi-

dual words but which is that of the sentence as a whole, arises in the form of तात्पर्यार्थ. It will then be found that unlike the अन्विताभिधान-वादिन्s they start from words to a sentence rather than from a sentence to words. It has already been observed that the views of the अन्विताभिधानवादिन्s are useful at the initial stage of Sanskrit teaching, that those of the अभिहितान्वयवादिन्s must be taken into account particularly at the advanced stage, and that the combination (समुच्चय) of both of them would thus be fruitful in Sanskrit teaching as a whole. It is with this end in view that the principles of the अभिहितान्वयवादिन्s about the power (शक्ति) of detached words in language have been detailed in the preceding section. While dealing with the दण्डान्वय and खण्डान्वय we have already explained the significance of the three principles of आकाङ्क्षा, योग्यता and सन्निधि as formulated by the अभिहितान्वयवादिन्s. It will now be advisable to turn to the तात्पर्यवृत्ति of that school after noting the special features of आकाङ्क्षा, योग्यता and सन्निधि, which establish relations between the senses of independent words and lead us to तात्पर्य,–the meaning of the whole sentence. According to the अभिहितान्वय-वादिन्s then a sentence is a group of words* possessing आकाङ्क्षा, योग्यता and सन्निधि.

Now the special feature of आकाङ्क्षा is that it does not merely lie in the juxtaposition of words, as in

* वाक्यं पदसमूहः—तर्कसङ्ग्रहः ।

the expression 'घटः कर्मत्वमानयनं कृतिः' (pot-object-hood; bringing-action) in which words are not mutually expectant (साकाङ्क्ष). आकाङ्क्षा can be found between the crude form (प्रकृति) of a word and the affix (प्रत्यय) applied to it. For example, in the sentence 'घटमानय' (Bring a pot) the apprehension (ज्ञान) of the objective case-affix 'अम्' after the word 'घट' shows its expectancy with the words 'घट' and 'आनय' and beccmes the cause of the verbal comprehension (शाब्दबोध) that 'घट' is the object of the verb 'आनय'.

Secondly, योग्यता means consistency or proper connection (अन्वय, सम्बन्ध) of the meaning of a word with that of another word. This proper connection depends upon the non-contradiction of our empiric experience. For instance, in the sentence 'घटमानय' the meanings of the words 'घटम्'. and 'आनय' have between them a proper connection or consistency which does not contradict our experience. The sentence, therefore, leads us to verbal comprehension. On the other hand, in the sentence 'आकाशमानय' (Bring the sky) the meanings of the words 'आकाशम्' and 'आनय' have between them an improper connection which *contradicts* our experience. The latter sentence, therefore, does not yield a consistent meaning.

Thirdly, सन्निधि or आसत्ति (contiguity, proximity) is usually defined as the juxtaposition of consecutive words without an interval. If words are

separated from one another by the intervention of other words, the connection (अन्वय) of their meanings cannot be understood. For instance, if we say 'गिरिर्भुक्तमग्निमान् देवदत्तेन' (the mountain, has eaten, fiery, Devadatta), the expression does not lead to *verbal comprehension, since suitable* words are not placed in juxtaposition; while the sentences 'गिरिरग्निमान्, भुक्तं देवदत्तेन' (The mountain is fiery; देवदत्त has eaten) yield meanings on account of juxtaposition. The नव्यनैयायिकs, however, reject this kind of आसत्ति and *psychologically* define it as an *immediate recollection* (उपस्थिति, स्मृति) of the meanings of words through their 'वृत्ति' (relation of words to meanings). They say that even when words in a verse are separated by the intervention of other words, we can have verbal comprehension. Hence contiguity or proximity in the form of *uninterrupted recollection* of meanings related to words through the वृत्तिs called शक्ति (expression) or लक्षणा (implication) is the cause of verbal comprehension, and not the first kind of contiguity. It does not matter whether words in a sentence are proximate or not proximate to one another; but the recollection of word-meanings mutually related must be immediate. This does not imply that any meaning of any word in any form is recollected. The suitability of words depends, of course, upon the non-contradiction of our experience. Such आसत्ति itself is the cause of verbal comprehension and not the knowledge of आसत्ति.

In connection with this आसत्ति the नैयायिकs psychologically explain how the comprehension of a sentence takes place through individual words. In this respect they say that while reading a book or hearing a speech the perception of the first word in a sentence leaves *an impression* on our mind and then that of the second, third, etc. Though such perceptions are transitory, the impressions left by them last for a long time and awaken our *memory*. Thus through the impressions of consecutive words left on the mind there arises in us a *collective recollection* of all words. This recollection is of the nature of *collective cognition* (समूहालम्बनात्मक ज्ञान) and is itself the knowledge of आसत्ति. Like a single perception arising from the contact of our sense-organs with a collection of objects,, as a picture, a book, a table, a clock, etc. a single recollection can arise in us from several impressions of words. The stimulus of the collective recollection (समूहालम्बनात्मक स्मृति) is the perception of the last letter of the last word, accompanied by the impressions of preceding words. Just as the collective recollection of a single word 'देवदत्त' occurs to us by the perception of the last letter 'त्त', aided by the consecutive impressions of the preceding letters, similarly the recollection of the last letter of the last word in a sentence, aided by the consecutive impressions of the preceding words in it, arises in us. As this collective recollection of words, otherwise called आसत्ति, does take place in the mind, it

becomes the cause of creating a *synthetic comprehension* of words, sentences, paragraphs, etc.

The प्राचीननैयायिकs, however, describe the genesis of this recollection in a somewhat different way. As all knowledge, they say, is a transient phenomenon, the recollection of every preceding word also is transient. Hence several recollections of several words would not stand together simultaneously, and thus verbal comprehension would be impossible. For this reason it must be said that the *recollection,* which is related to the meanings of words and which is the cause of verbal comprehension, itself being of the nature of *collective cognition,* is *one* and not manifold. This collective recollection alone leads to the *simultaneous* verbal comprehension of the meanings of *all* words connected as क्रिया (action), कर्म (object), करण (instrument), etc., according to the maxim of 'pigeons on a threshing-floor' (खलेकपोतन्याय). Relating to this maxim there is a verse which means as follows: "Just as pigeons old, full-grown and young, simultaneously come down to a threshing-floor for picking grains, similarly in a sentence (e. g. घटमानय) the meanings of words (e g. घटम् and आनय) being mutually connected together as क्रिया, कर्म, etc., become the object of *simultaneous* verbal comprehension." †

---

† वृद्धा युवानः शिशवः कपोताः खले यथामी युगपत्पतन्ति ।
तथैव सर्वे युगपत्पदार्थाः परस्परेणान्वयिनो भवन्ति ॥

Quoted in the सिद्धान्तमुक्तावलि under verse 83.

Some नैयायिकs who do not recognize the above simultaneous recollection (समूहालम्बनात्मक स्मृति) say: " That meaning of a word, which is expectant of, and consistent with, the meaning of another contiguous word, can be understood from words themselves, after it is connected with another meaning. "$ That is to say, the meaning of a word having a connection with another meaning is first understood from words. Similarly, the meaning of the parts of a sentence (खण्डवाक्य) arising from the connection of several meanings can first be obtained from words, and the comprehension of the meanings of parts (खण्डवाक्य) then leads to the comprehension of the meaning of the whole sentence (महावाक्य). Even though we suppose that the comprehension of the meaning of former parts vanishes on account of the transitoriness of knowledge, yet the recollection of the meaning of those parts or subordinate clauses (अवान्तरवाक्य) lasts in our mind. This recollection, therefore, leads us to the verbal comprehension of the whole sentence. For instance, in the sentence 'घटमानय' we first understand from the word 'घटम्' the meaning of the part that 'घट' (jar) is the object (कर्म) of some action, or is connected with some action. This meaning of the word 'घटम्' being connected with the meaning of 'bringing' obtained from the

---

$ यद्यदाकाङ्क्षितं योग्यं सन्निधानं प्रपद्यते ।
तेन तेनान्वितः स्वार्थः पदैरेवावगम्यते ॥
Quoted in the सिद्धान्तमुक्तावलि under verse 83.

word 'आनय' yields the meaning of the whole sentence. The नैयायिकs, therefore, are not required *to postulate the superfluous स्फोट which, according to the वैयाकरणs, is said to contain the whole unified* meaning of an author or speaker, and is also said to be revealed by the letters, words, sentences, paragraphs, nay, the whole book he writes. शङ्कराचार्य here tells us, as we have already seen, that the synthetic activity of the mind (समस्तप्रत्यवमर्शिनी बुद्धि) is able to give us a unified meaning from letters, words, sentences, paragraphs, etc. (सिद्धान्तमुक्तावलि).

Now what should be supplied (अध्याहृत) when a sentence is incomplete in consequence of something being unexpressed? Are we to supply an actual word or simply its meaning? That is to say, if, for instance, in the incomplete sentence 'द्वारम्—' (—door) the verb is unexpressed, should we supply the actual word 'पिधेहि' (shut) or would it do if simply the general meaning of 'shutting' occurs to the mind without our being required to supply a particular word in the sentence? Here the प्राभाकरमीमांसकs say that it is better to supply simply the meaning than the word, since we are more concerned with the meaning than with the word used to indicate it; and unless the meaning of 'shutting' first occurs to us from the incomplete sentence 'द्वारम्—', we cannot supply the word 'पिधेहि'. The meaning which first occurs to us in such cases should, therefore, be supplied rather than the actual word. It is not necessary that the

recollection of meaning should arise only through a word; for, it can also arise without the use of a word. It is, therefore, preferable to supply in an incomplete sentence 'meaning' (अर्थाध्याहार) rather than a 'word' (पदाध्याहार). The नैयायिकs and वेदान्तिन्s* say against this that in such cases *a word* must be supplied and not simply its meaning, if we want to have verbal comprehension. Meaning, without the actual use of a word, can be conveyed by perception (प्रत्यक्षप्रमाण) also. If, for example, a jar (घट) is placed in front of us, we can show it merely by means of gesture (i. e. with the finger) and say 'एनं—पश्य' (See this —) without using the word 'घटम्'. Here, the meaning of the object 'घट' is understood, though the actual word 'घट' for it is not used. But it must be remembered that this meaning of the jar is understood through *perception* and not through verbal comprehension (शाब्दबोध), which requires us to understand the connection (अन्वय) of *words* in a sentence. It is, therefore, necessary to supply the actual words 'पिधेहि' and 'घटम्' in the incomplete sentences 'द्वारम् —' and 'एनं—पश्य' respectively, so as to show the connection of words and have verbal comprehension. For, verbal comprehension is possible only if the cognition of mean-

---

* मानान्तरोपस्थापितपदार्थस्यान्वयबोधाभावात् 'पदजन्या' इति। अत एवाश्रुतस्थले तत्तत्पदाध्याहारः। 'द्वारम्' इत्यादौ 'पिधेहि' इति॥

—वेदान्तपरिभाषा, प्र. ४; सिद्धान्तमुक्तावलि, श्लोक ८३.

ing takes place through particular *words*, which must be supplied to complete the sense of a sentence. When a word is thus supplied, the perception of it conveys to us its meaning by means of वृत्ति (relation of a word to its meaning), and the apprehension of this meaning further leads us to the verbal comprehension of the whole sentence. *Again*, in every sentence the verb and words with particular case-affixes (कारकपदानि) are expectant (साकाङ्क्ष) of one another. Unless, therefore, the actual verb 'पिधेहि' is supplied (पदाध्याहार), the कारकपद ' द्वारम् ' would not yield its complete meaning. There are other examples where a word alone must be supplied (पदाध्याहार) and not its meaning. If we simply say 'पुष्पेभ्यः—' (—for flowers), the actual word 'स्पृहयति' (craves) must be supplied, as the peculiar use of the dative case in the word 'पुष्पेभ्यः' requires us, according to a grammatical rule, to supply the verb 'स्पृहयति' alone and not merely the meaning of 'craving', which may be expressed in any other way. This principle of पदाध्याहार (supplying a word) is very important in language-teaching. When a language is being taught newly, mere gestures, intonation, etc., used by the teacher will sometimes convey meanings to the students. It must, however, be noted that though the meaning can be conveyed by gestures, etc., without the use of words, yet in language-teaching actual words introduced to pupils are more important than other means of

conveying the meaning. It will, therefore, be advisable to make a clear statement of *actual words* in sentences, though gestures, etc., will be used in direct association with those words for amplifying their meanings. In the matter of construing and understanding literature at the advanced stage too it is necessary to supply actual *words* in incomplete sentences rather than their meanings only. (सिद्धान्तमुक्तावली, तर्कदीपिका).

It has been observed above that the recollection of the meanings of parts or subordinate clauses (अवान्तरवाक्य) leads us to the verbal comprehension of a large sentence or paragraph (महावाक्य) as a whole. In other words, a large sentence or paragraph is a collection of subordinate clauses, † which are mutually connected together by means of आकाङ्क्षा, योग्यता and आसत्ति. When, after knowing the mutual connection of different subordinate clauses, a special unified sense (तात्पर्यार्थ) is exhibited, we get syntactical unity (एकवाक्यता). This syntactical unity is based on a two-fold relation: (1) that of a word to a sentence of which it forms part (पदैकवाक्यता), and (2) that of a sentence to another sentence (वाक्यैकवाक्यता). (1) As regards पदैकवाक्यता the मीमांसक्s think that अर्थवाद्s (corroborative or eulogistic sentences) never directly signify a command (विधि) or prohibition (निषेध); but that they indicate their meanings by means of an

† वाक्योच्चयो महावाक्यम् । (साहित्यदर्पणः, २।१)

explanatory repetition (अनुवाद्) *or a subordinate* statement. The sentences comprising अर्थवाद्s cannot, therefore, yield the principal meaning, but merely praise or censure an injunction (विधि), which indicates the principal meaning. The अर्थवाद्s are not, however, meaningless, since they are syntactically connected with an injunction or the principal sentence. Thus the collection of words contained in an अर्थवाद् conveys the meaning of 'praise' which is required by an injunction, occupies the position of a single word, and forms syntactical unity with the sentence containing that injunction. Hence अर्थवाद् serving as a single word forms a syntactical* whole with an injunction (विधि). In other words, the relation of an अर्थवाद् to an injunction is respectively that *of a word to a sentence* of which it forms part. This is called पदैकवाक्यता by the मीमांसकs. (2) Now syntactical unity manifested in the relation of *a sentence* † *to another sentence* (वाक्यैकवाक्यता) can be found where two (or more) sentences, each of which indicates distinctly a

---

* विध्यपेक्षितप्राशस्त्यरूपपदार्थप्रत्यायकतयाऽर्थवादपदसमुदायस्य पदस्थानीयतया विधिवाक्येनैकवाक्यत्वं भवतीत्यर्थवादवाक्यानां पदैकवाक्यता।

—वेदान्तपरिभाषा, प्र. ४.

† क्व तर्हि वाक्यैकवाक्यता ? यत्र प्रत्येकं भिन्नभिन्नसंसर्गप्रतिपादकयोर्वाक्ययोराकाङ्क्षावशेन महावाक्यार्थबोधकत्वम् । . . . वाक्यानां परस्परापेक्षिताङ्गाङ्गिभावबोधकतया एकवाक्यता । तदुक्तं भट्टपादैः— ' स्वार्थबोधे समाप्तानामङ्गाङ्गित्वाद्यपेक्षया। वाक्यानामेकवाक्यत्वं पुनः संहत्य जायते ॥ ' इति । —वेदान्तपरिभाषा, प्र. ४.

different relation of words and their meanings, yield the meaning of a larger sentence or paragraph on account of their mutual expectancy. Here, the meaning of one sentence being connected with that of another, the two (or more) sentences together express *one* meaning in the form of *purport* (तात्पर्य). Thus sentences showing the mutually expected relation of principal and subordinate, are found to possess syntactical unity. Here, कुमारिलभट्ट says–" When sentences, which are complete in respect of their own meanings, again combine because of their relation of principal and subordinate, they form syntactical unity. "This syntactical unity in respect of sentences (वाक्यैकवाक्यता) is itself the meaning of a major sentence or a passage in the form of *purport* (तात्पर्य). Before we understand the meaning of such a longer sentence or a passage (महावाक्य), it is necessary for us to understand the meanings of subordinate clauses (अवान्तरवाक्यs).

The above syntactical unity lies especially in the intended meaning or purport (तात्पर्य) of a speaker or writer according to the नैयायिकs. They, therefore, hold that the unified meaning of a sentence depends upon the *intention*$ of the speaker or writer and that a definite knowledge of this intention is as much the cause of verbal comprehension as that of आकाङ्क्षा, योग्यता and आसत्ति. Whether

---

$ (a) वक्तुरिच्छा तु तात्पर्यम्। —भाषापरिच्छेदः ८४

(b) तत्प्रतीतीच्छयोच्चरितत्वं तात्पर्यम्। —तर्कदीपिका

the meaning of a word should be construed with the meaning of a particular word alone depends more on the intention of the speaker or writer than on आकाङ्क्षा. For instance, in the sentence 'अयमेति पुत्रो राज्ञः पुरुषोऽपसार्यताम्' there is expectancy (आकाङ्क्षा) between the words 'पुत्रः' and 'राज्ञः' as well as 'राज्ञः' and 'पुरुषः'; and the sentence being thus ambiguous would either mean, 'Here comes the son of the King, the man should be removed', or 'Here comes the son (my son), the man (officer) of the King should be removed.' In this case a doubt arises whether the word 'राज्ञः' is to be construed with 'पुत्रः' or 'पुरुषः', and it can be removed by knowing the intended meaning (तात्पर्य) of the speaker or writer that the word 'राज्ञः' is to be construed with 'पुत्रः' and not with 'पुरुषः'. Knowledge of तात्पर्य (purport, drift) is, therefore, the fourth condition necessary for verbal comprehension in addition to आकाङ्क्षा, योग्यता and आसत्ति. Again, a word in a sentence has sometimes more than one meaning. Whether it means this or that in a particular context depends also upon the intention of the speaker or writer. For example, the sentence 'सैन्धवमानय' can either mean 'Bring *salt*' or 'Bring a *horse*', as the word 'सैन्धव' has two meanings, viz., 'salt' or 'a horse'. Which of these two meanings is to be accepted in a particular context is determined by the hearer after knowing the intention of the speaker. If the speaker is dining, the word 'सैन्धव' would mean 'salt' and if

he is going out, it would mean 'a horse'. For, at the time of dining the speaker's intention cannot be that a *horse* should be brought; while at the time of going out he cannot intend that *salt* should be brought. The particular occassion or context (प्रकरण), therefore, demands that we should understand only a particular meaning which can be determined by knowing the intention or purport of the speaker. If we suppose that the apprehension of purport is not a cause of verbal comprehension, the word 'सैन्धव' would not sometimes mean 'salt' and sometimes 'a horse'. For this reason it must be admitted that there is a causal relation between the knowledge of intention or purport and verbal comprehension.

नागेश$ thinks that the apprehension of तात्पर्य is essential only in the case of equivocal words, and that the mere context, etc., can determine तात्पर्य. Others also say that purpose (अर्थ), context (प्रकरण), a special characteristic (लिङ्ग), propriety (औचित्य), place (देश), and time (काल) are the determinants of the meanings of words,† and since they always precede verbal comprehension, they, rather than the knowledge

$ नानार्थस्थले लोके तात्पर्यं तु एतत्पदं वाक्यं वा एतदर्थप्रत्ययाय मयोच्चार्यत इति प्रयोक्तुरिच्छारूपम् । तात्पर्यनियामकं च लोके प्रकरणादिकमेव । —परमलघुमञ्जूषा.

† अर्थात्प्रकरणाल्लिङ्गादौचित्याद्देशकालतः ।
शब्दार्थास्तु विभिद्यन्ते न रूपादेव केवलात् ॥

of तात्पर्य, should be held to be the causes of verbal comprehension. The नैयायिकs, however, think that if 'context' etc., are taken to be the causes, it is clear that all those causes precede every verbal comprehension. But since those causes are manifold, it cannot be decided what particular cause precedes what particular verbal comprehension. Instead of grouping together all those manifold causes as showing the purport or intention, it is better, according to the law of parsimony (लाघव), to accept the knowledge of purport itself as a single cause of verbal comprehension. According to the नैयायिकs God is the author or speaker of the Vedas and the apprehension of his intention is the cause of verbal comprehension; while in the case of words mechanically repeated by a parrot they take the intention of God or a human trainer to to be the cause.

The वेदान्तिन्s along with the मीमांसकs accept तात्पर्य as the cause of verbal comprehension. If they would not accept तात्पर्य, all their attempts for the ascertainment of the purport of Vedic sentences would be futile. They, however, say that the definitions of तात्पर्य formulated by the नैयायिकs, as, 'the intention of the speaker' (वक्तुरिच्छा) or 'the utterance of words with a desire to convey a meaning' (तत्प्रतीतीच्छयोच्चरितत्वम्) are not correct. For, it is not always true that there is an intention or desire of the speaker to convey a meaning. For instance, there can be no intention or desire of

communication in the words mechanically uttered by a parrot or an idiot; yet those words are understood by us. Secondly, a Vedic priest repeating Vedic texts without knowing their meaning cannot be said to have an intention or desire to convey a meaning; yet the words uttered by him can be understood by one who knows their meaning. Thirdly, when a teacher is found to give a wrong explanation of a text, the student realizes that the teacher does not understand what he says. It cannot be here said that the teacher has a definite intention or purport, since what he supplies as an explanation differs from actual experience and the meaning of the text. We cannot even say that in the Vedic texts uttered unintentionally by a Vedic priest there is the intention or purport of God who is supposed to be the author of the Vedas. For, schools like those of the नास्तिकs and the मीमांसकs deny the existence of God and his authorship of the Vedas; yet they are found to interpret the meaning of the Vedas. Thus declaring the नैयायिकs' definition of तात्पर्य to be wrong the वेदान्तिन्s say that तात्पर्य (purport) is 'the capacity of words in a sentence to express a particular meaning.' † That is to say, words themselves have the inherent capacity (शक्ति) to produce a particular cognition of the correlation (संसर्ग, अन्वय) of their meanings. If the sentence 'गेहे घटः' (A pot in the house) is uttered without understanding its meaning, the sentence

† तत्प्रतीतिजननयोग्यत्वं तात्पर्यम् । —वेदान्तपरिभाषा, प्र. ४.

itself has the inherent capacity for producing the cognition of the *relation* of 'घट' (a pot)—and not that of 'पट' (a garment)—to 'गेह' (the house). The listener is able to understand this particular meaning in spite of its comprehension or non-comprehension by the speaker. Hence the capacity of the sentence to convey the particular relation between 'घट' and 'गेह' is called तात्पर्य (purport), and the apprehension of this तात्पर्य leads us to verbal comprehension. This capacity or power (शक्ति) of a sentence is known when it is not impossible for us to show the mutual relation of words in that sentence. As in the sentence 'गेहे घटः' there is no impossibility of establishing the relation (अन्वयानुपपत्ति) between 'गेह' and 'घट', the capacity of that sentence to show the particular relation of 'location and the thing fit to be located' (आधाराधेयभावसम्बन्ध) is purport itself. Thus according to the वेदान्तिन्s the impossibility of establishing a relation (अन्वयानुपपत्ति), non-accomplishment of purpose (प्रयोजनासिद्धि) and context, etc. (प्रकरणादिक) help us indirectly in determining the purport of sentences. If, then, the existence, in a sentence, of words *fit to convey a particular sense* can be defined as 'purport', a non-Vedic (लौकिक) or a Vedic sentence, though unintelligible to the speaker, has inherent capacity to convey a meaning according to this flawless definition.

Here the नैयायिक्s after quoting the sentence 'सैन्धवमानय' raise an objection that although the word

'सैन्धव' has capacity to signify (तत्प्रतीतिजननयोग्यत्वम्) two meanings, yet the speaker's *desire* (वक्तुरिच्छा) to convey a specific meaning ('salt' or 'a horse') in a specific context must be taken into account.

The वेदान्तिन्s answer this objection by adding a qualification, viz., 'तदन्यप्रतीतीच्छयाऽनुच्चरितत्वम्' to their above definition of तात्पर्य, and give the whole definition as: 'तत्प्रतीतिजननयोग्यत्वे सति तदन्यप्रतीतीच्छयाऽ-नुच्चरितत्वम्'. Purport then means "the capacity of words to convey a particular meaning in the absence of their utterance with the desire or intention of conveying any other meaning." In this way, though the word 'सैन्धव' has capacity to signify *two* meanings, viz., 'salt' and 'a horse', yet if a person utters that word while dining, his servant, after understanding the purport of the sentence from this particular context, will take the word 'सैन्धव' to mean 'salt' alone and not 'a horse', because the word 'सैन्धव' having capacity to mean 'salt' is not uttered with the intention of conveying the other meaning, viz., 'a horse'. Again, the word 'सैन्धव' cannot *simultaneously* suggest the two meanings. For, when the purport of the sentence 'सैन्धवमानय' is understood, the meaning that first occurs to the servant is 'salt' and then 'a horse' in due order. Although we suppose that the two meanings of an equivocal word—as in the case of श्लेष—are meant to be simultaneously perceived in a literary passage the above definition is not inapplicable, since th

word 'तत्' in the definition can include two meanings also. This definition of 'तात्पर्य' is thus equally applicable to non-Vedic as well as Vedic sentences unintelligently uttered either by a parrot or a priest without any desire or intention of communication.

According to the मीमांसक्s and वेदान्तिन्s शक्ति or the inherent power residing in all things is a distinct category. Just as there is inherent power in the fire to burn anything, so in words also, say the मीमांसक्s and वेदान्तिन्s, there is inherent power, which being distinct from words and objects denoted by them is the determining characteristic (अवच्छेदक) of their capacity to express a particular meaning. Such words in a sentence having inherent power in them to show the *mutual relation* of their meanings naturally express Purport. Thus purport, which consists in the inherent power of words or sentences to produce a *synthetic* cognition independently of the intention of the speaker (वक्तुरिच्छा), is a cause of verbal comprehension according to the वेदान्तिन्s. The वेदान्तिन्s and the मीमांसक्s, therefore, accept तात्पर्यवृत्ति in this particular sense and often utilize this important linguistic principle in determining the unified sense of the Vedic texts. They always determine the purport or synthetic meaning of the Vedas by employing the six मीमांसा rules of interpretation, viz. (i) Unity of the beginning and conclusion of a work (उपक्रमोपसंहार), (ii) Repetition of the main topic in various

contexts (अभ्यास), (iii) Novelty of the subject-matter (अपूर्वता), (iv) Fruit or result (फल), (v) Praise or incidental remarks as distinguished from the main theme (अर्थवाद), and (vi) Arguments in favour of the main topic (उपपत्ति). The मीमांसकs employ these rules for determining the purport of the कर्मकाण्ड of the Vedas, while the वेदान्तिन्s (शङ्कराचार्य) use them for establishing the unified meaning or तात्पर्य of the ज्ञानकाण्ड that all Upanishadic sentences are closely related in their meaning to the all-pervading ब्रह्मन् alone. § The above rules of मीमांसा are also very useful in determining the purport of the धर्मशास्त्र (law); while in the case of secular (लौकिक) sentences contained in poetry and other forms of literature the purport is determined by means of प्रकरण (context), औचित्य (propriety), देश (place), काल (time) etc., as referred to above.

Here अभेदरत्नकार says that though the apprehension of purport (तात्पर्यज्ञान) is necessary for verbal comprehension at particular places, it is not required for every verbal comprehension. He further adds that when there arises a doubt about the purport of a passage or when it is certain that there is the total absence of purport, no verbal comprehension is possible. But if in the beginning we are in doubt about the purport and if afterwards we gradually determine the purport, verbal compre-

§ सर्वेषु वेदान्तेषु वाक्यानि तात्पर्येणैतस्यैवार्थस्य प्रतिपादकत्वेन समनुगतानि । —ब्र. सू. भाष्य, १.१.४.

hension is possible. In other words, the knowledge of purport becomes the cause of verbal comprehension after the period of doubt. If we are doubtful as to whether a sentence means this or that, the knowledge of तात्पर्य helps us to understand the unified sense of that sentence. Or, if we misunderstand the view of a speaker or writer, the knowledge of purport is useful for removing our misunderstanding. It is, therefore, not true that all verbal comprehension takes place only after the knowledge of तात्पर्य. [वेदान्तपरिभाषा, प्र. ४]

It may be said in connection with the above view that students learning a language like Sanskrit are always in doubt regarding the purport of a sentence, verse or paragraph of the book they read. It is, therefore, desirable to remove this doubt by telling the purport and facilitating verbal comprehension *before* and *after* the detailed study of a thought-unit. With this end in view Shastris usually tell the purport twice, before and after the detailed study of a passage; and Sanskrit commentators supply in their commentaries अवतरणिकाs or introductory remarks containing the purport of sentences and paragraphs of the original texts. This procedure in oral teaching or in written commentaries really helps the analytico-synthetic or intensive study of literature and Shastras in the following way. The detailed study of a passage enables the teacher and the taught to *analyse* the principal and subordinate parts of sentences conveying corresponding ideas; while the purport told at the beginning and end of

the detailed study maintains *synthesis* of ideas. The telling of the purport (तात्पर्यकथन), as adopted by Shastris in their teaching is, therefore, a wise plan worthy of being followed by all teachers of Sanskrit. The teacher may either *tell* this purport to students or may elicit it from them through suitable questions. Any way, due attention to the *Purport* must always be paid by the teacher in the teaching of *prose* rather than of poetry.

It has been observed above that the वेदान्तिन्s accepting शक्ति (power) as a distinct category give a rigidly technical definition of तात्पर्य as "the inherent capacity of words to produce the cognition of a particular meaning." The नैयायिकs, however, do not accept शक्ति as a distinct category, but identify it with the will or intention (इच्छा) of God or a human speaker. This is why they define तात्पर्य as "the *intention* or *will* of the speaker." With the exception of words reproduced by a parrot, an idiot, a Vedic priest or a gramophone it may be generalized that intention is a predominant factor of any speech or writing. Although there is no intention in a parrot, an idiot, a gramophone or a book itself, yet the original speaker or writer whose words are reproduced or recorded by each of the above has definitely an intention. Unless words are uttered with a conscious purpose or intention, they cannot be meaningful. It is only due to the speaker's intention that peculiar words acquire peculiar meanings in different contexts. There is, therefore, much truth in the definition of

तात्पर्य given by the नैयायिकs, though that definition might be faulty from a strictly scientific point of view. While dealing with equivocal words and adding the qualification 'तदन्यप्रतीतीच्छयाऽनुच्चरितत्वम्' (non-utterance with the intention of conveying any other meaning) to their own definition of तात्पर्य even the वेदान्तिन्s indirectly acknowledge the factor of intention. Hence the definition of the नैयायिकs is serviceable for all practical purposes. Although the sentences repeated by a parrot or an idiot are not uttered with the intention or desire of communication, yet it cannot be said that Vedic sentences mechanically repeated by priests and speeches or songs recorded by gramophones are not uttered with a desire of communication. It is then found that Vedic sentences etc., are uttered with the desire of communicating their meaning to the hearer, and that the knowledge of तात्पर्य is the cause of understanding the meaning arising from sentences desired to be communicated. That तात्पर्य is contained in the intention of the speaker or writer is a well-known fact. Nothing, therefore, can be gained except contradiction to this well-known fact in formulating a rigidly technical definition of तात्पर्य as the वेदान्तिन्s do. As the cases where the intention of the speaker is absent are rare, it is preferable to accept for practical purposes the definition of तात्पर्य as formulated by the नैयायिकs and to pay due attention to the intention of the speaker or writer in language-study. The knowledge of तात्पर्य is, therefore,

the cause of verbal comprehension which arises from a sentence desired to be communicated.

XV. IMPLICATION (लक्षणा)

Sometimes peculiar words in a sentence stand in the way of understanding its general purport (तात्पर्य). We are, therefore, required to understand those words in a sense other than the primary one (वाच्य, शक्य) for the purpose of making them suit the context or purport. Thus when after hearing or reading a word in a sentence we have to abandon its primary sense (मुख्यार्थबाध) on account of its inapplicability to or incompatibility with (अनुपपत्ति) the other words or context of that sentence, and when we accept there another (implied) sense, which is in some way related to the primary sense (तद्योग, शक्यसम्बन्ध), we have to resort to the process called Implication or लक्षणा. In other words, लक्षणा occurs when the primary sense, which is opposed to some means of knowledge like 'direct perception' (प्रत्यक्षप्रमाण), cannot be accepted, and when, for the suitability of the context, we have to suppose another meaning which is related to the express or primary meaning. For instance, in the sentence 'गङ्गायां घोषः' (A hamlet is situated on the Ganges) the primary meaning of the word 'गङ्गा' is 'गङ्गाप्रवाह' (the stream of the Ganges) which first arises in our mind; but this meaning is opposed to the direct

perception, as the hamlet cannot be situated on the *stream*. The purport of the speaker in uttering the sentence is that we should understand the meaning 'गङ्गातट' (the bank of the Ganges) from the word 'गङ्गा', and not the express meaning 'प्रवाह' (the stream) *which is incompatible with the purport*. We, therefore, abandon the primary or express meaning 'the stream' and understand the *implied* or *secondary* meaning 'the bank' which is ralated to the primary meaning 'the stream'. We understand the implied meaning (लक्ष्यार्थ) 'bank' from the word 'गङ्गा' according to the following *psychological* process—

The Knowledge of 'the bank' does not first arise in our mind but arises after the knowledge of the primary meaning 'stream'. We first know the word 'गङ्गा' and its primary meaning 'stream', after which we understand the implication that the express meaning 'stream' is related to 'the bank' through the relation of proximity (सामीप्य) or conjunction (संयोग). Here, according to the *mental law of associtiion* that the knowledge of one thing leads to the memory of another thing related to it,$ we recollect the *bank*. We have already seen that there is a relation (सम्बन्ध) between a word and its meaning, and that the two related things (सम्बन्धी) showing that relation are a word and its meaning. When one related thing, i. e., a word is known, we can recollect another related thing, i. e., the mean-

$ एकसम्बन्धिज्ञानमपरसम्बन्धिस्मारकम् ।

ing. Here, according to this mental law the knowledge of the one related thing, i. e., the word 'गङ्गा' which also contains the implied meaning 'bank' through its relation of conjunction or proximity to the primary meaning 'stream', leads us to recollect the other related thing, viz., the implied meaning 'bank.' Thus from the whole sentence 'गङ्गायां घोषः' we understand by Implication (लक्षणा) the reasonable sense that the hamlet is situated on the *bank* (गङ्गातटे घोषः). Here the relation of the word 'गङ्गा' with its primary meaning 'stream' is *direct* and with the secondary meaning 'bank' it is *indirect* (परम्परासम्बन्ध), since the word 'गङ्गा' is directly related to the primary meaning 'stream' which is again related to the secondary meaning 'bank'. लक्षणावृत्ति thus occurs when the relation of a word is understood *indirectly through the primary meaning*. The relation of conjunction (संयोग) between the primary meaning 'stream' and the secondary meaning 'bank' is here called लक्षणा or Implication.† Although this relation of conjunction is originally between the *things* 'गङ्गा' and 'तट', i. e., between 'the stream' and 'the bank' and not between the *words* 'गङ्गा' and 'तट', yet the word 'गङ्गा' is indirectly related to the word 'तट'. Thus the knowledge of 'the bank' being derived from implication (लक्षणा), the meaning 'bank' becomes 'लक्ष्य' (the thing implied). The well-known meaning of a word is its express or primary

† लक्षणा शक्यसम्बन्धस्तात्पर्यानुपपत्तितः ।—भाषापरिच्छेदः, ८२

meaning, yet when this meaning is incompatiable with the context, we invariably resort to लक्षणा. The implied meaning (लक्ष्यार्थ) is, however, of secondary importance as compared to the express meaning. Of course, if the purport of the speaker can be ascertained by means of the primary meanings of words, it is not proper to resort to लक्षणा and accept the secondary meaning.

Now wherein does the incompatibility (अनुपपत्ति), which is the essential condition of Implication (लक्षणा-बीज), lie? Does it lie in अन्वयानुपपत्ति (Incompatibility of ascertaining the logical or syntactical relation) or in तात्पर्यानुपपत्ति (Incompatibility of ascertaining the Purport of the speaker)? Here, some schools, the प्राचीननैयायिकs and the आलङ्कारिकs, for instance, say that अन्वयानुपपत्ति is the essential condition of लक्षणा. But instead of regarding अन्वयानुपपत्ति as a separate condition of Implication it is better, according to other schools like the नव्यनैयायिकs and the वेदान्तिन्s to regard तात्पर्यानुपपत्ति as the essential condition in all cases, and include the former in the latter. The reasons for this are as follows—

For example, in the sentence 'यष्टीः प्रवेशय' (Admit the sticks into the dining room) there would be no necessity of resorting to Implication. For, it being possible to admit the sticks into the room, the logical connection (अन्वय) between 'प्रवेशय' and the primary meaning of 'यष्टीः' (sticks) can be well established. Hence अन्वयानुपपत्ति which is supposed to be the essential condition of Implication does not occur in

this sentence. On the other hand, there is तात्पर्यानुपपत्ति here, since the purport of the speaker is not that 'sticks' (primary meaning) should be admitted, but it is that '*ascetics* with sticks' (यष्टिधराः) should be admitted for dining. If the primary meaning of 'यष्टीः' (sticks) would be accepted here, it would be impossible to serve food to the sticks. This incompatibility can be removed by taking the implied meaning of 'यष्टीः' as 'यष्टिधरान्' (ascetics with sticks). The implication is thus rooted in तात्पर्यानुपपत्ति and we, therefore, take the sentence 'यष्टीः प्रवेशय' to mean 'यष्टिधरान् प्रवेशय' (The ascetics with sticks should be admitted).

Again, in the sentence 'काकेभ्यो दधि रक्ष्यताम्' (Protect the curds from the crows) it is possible to establish the syntactical relation (अन्वय) between 'रक्ष्यताम्' and 'काकेभ्यः', the primary meaning of which is 'crows'. If we shall understand from this sentence that *animals other than the crows* may be allowed to spoil the curds, then we might miss the purport of the speaker. According to the purport of the speaker we should not merely understand the primary meaning 'crows' from the word 'काकेभ्यः' but should also take by implication *all creatures* that spoil the curds (दध्युपघातकाः प्राणिनः). For, the purport of the speaker here is that the curds should be protected from *all creatures*. If we would take simply the primary meaning 'crows', there would be तात्पर्यानुपपत्ति which can be removed by resorting to लक्षणा and understanding that the

curds should be protected not only from the crows but from all creatures.

Similarly, in the sentence 'छत्रिणो यान्ति' (The men with umbrellas are going) we are not to understand from the word 'छत्रिणः' merely its primary meaning, viz., 'men with umbrellas', but also to understand by implication 'the collection of all men with and without umbrellas', since the purport of the speaker is to make us know the latter meaning which is implied. If simply the primary meaning of 'छत्रिणः' be taken, there would be तात्पर्यानुपपत्ति which can be removed by taking the latter meaning.

Again, in the sentence 'विषं भुङ्क्ष्व' (Eat poison) the logical relation (अन्वय) of the primary meanings of the words 'विषम्' and 'भुङ्क्ष्व', i. e., of the object and the verb respectively, can be well established, though the eating of poison will surely result in death. The father's intended meaning (तात्पर्यं), however, in saying this sentence to his son is not that he should eat poison which causes death. The intended meaning is that the son should desist from dining at the house of the enemy. For all these reasons the condition of the incompatibility of establishing the *logical relation* (अन्वयानुपपत्तिर्लक्षणाबीजम्) *being non-pervasive* (अव्याप्त), *it is necessary* to accept the incompatibility of ascertaining the Purport as the essential condition of Implication (तात्पर्यानुपपत्तिर्लक्षणाबीजम्).

Moreover, all sentences in which there is अन्वयानुपपत्ति can be shown to involve तात्पर्यानुपपत्ति also.

The sentence 'गङ्गायां घोषः' is generally quoted as an example of अन्वयानुपपत्ति. The आलङ्कारिकs say here that the primary (express) meaning of the word 'गङ्गा' viz., 'the stream' cannot be logically connected with the meaning of 'घोष' (a hamlet) and that the implied meaning 'bank' should be understood from the word 'गङ्गा'. But this is an example as much of तात्पर्यानुपपत्ति as of अन्वयानुपपत्ति. For, if we take the primary meaning of the word 'गङ्गा', the sentence is also incapable of yielding the purport, which should imply 'the bank'. It is, therefore, better, according to the law of parsimony (लाघव) to take तात्पर्यानुपपत्ति as the only essential condition of Implication. There are several factors that determine the purport of a sentence. Thus in the example 'गङ्गायां घोषः' अन्वयानुपपत्ति is helpful as a factor of determining the Purport; in 'काकेभ्यो दधि रक्ष्यताम्' non-accomplishment of purpose (प्रयोजनासिद्धि) is helpful and in 'सैन्धवमानय' etc., context (प्रकरण), time (काल), and place (देश) are helpful in determining the purport.

If only अन्वयानुपपत्ति be supposed to be the cause of implication, another fault occurs as follows:—In the sentence 'गङ्गायां घोषः', the speaker purports that we should understand 'the bank' from the word 'गङ्गा', and we do understand actually that 'the bank' is implied by the word 'गङ्गा'. Now if the speaker purports that we should understand the meaning 'fish' from the word 'घोष', the implied meaning of 'घोष' would be 'a fish'. This rule for

understanding the speaker's purport would be violated if अन्वयानुपपत्ति would be supposed to be the condition of Implication. For, there would be no criterion to decide when the word 'गङ्गा' should imply 'the bank' and when the word 'घोष' should imply 'a fish'. For this reason it is necessary to accept the incompatibility of ascertaining the purport (तात्पर्यानुपपत्ति) as *the only cause of Implication.* In short, the knowledge of the speaker's purport leads us to understand the implied meaning (लक्ष्यार्थ). [सिद्धान्तमुक्तावलि; वेदान्तपरिभाषा.]

लक्षणा is divided into several varieties by the आलङ्कारिकs, नैयायिकs and वेदान्तिन्s according to different principles of division and the peculiar process involved in each variety. The most important and common varieties that are *indispensable to the expounding and understanding of the inner spirit of literature* and शास्त्रs may be noted as follows—

मम्मट gives the third condition of लक्षणा as 'रूढिप्रयोजनान्यतरत्' meaning thereby that along with the two conditions 'मुख्यार्थबाध' and 'तद्योग' either 'established usage' (रूढि) or 'a definite motive or purpose' (प्रयोजन) must justify a लक्षणा. The first variety is, therefore, called by him 'निरूढलक्षणा' and the second 'प्रयोजनवती लक्षणा'. He, from a scientific point of view, accepts निरूढलक्षणा in the case of words like 'कुशल', which etymologically (कुशान् लातीति) and hence *primarily* means 'दर्भग्रहीता' (one who handles कुश

grass), and which through usage or *secondarily* means ‘ चतुर ’ (clever). The purpose of this लक्षणा, which is rooted in this etymological sense, might have been known by people in ancient times; yet it is forgotten by us now owing to the रूढि (convention, usage) of the word ‘ कुशल ’ in the sense of ‘ चतुर ’, which we now take as the *primary* meaning of that word. The same may be said about the word ‘ लावण्य ’ which etymologically means ‘ saltiness ’ (लवणस्य भावः) and conventionally or primarily means ‘ beauty ’. All similar words like ‘ तैलम् ’ (तिलस्य विकारः), द्विरेफः (द्वौ रेफौ यस्य) etc., are now understood by us in their conventional and hence primary senses through usage, and their etymological senses are known by few persons. As we now take the conventional senses of those words to be primary, it is unnecessary for all practical purposes to resort to लक्षणा in the case of those conventional (रूढ) words. This is why साहित्यदर्पणकार and हेमचन्द्र are inclined not to recognize निरूढलक्षणा in the case of the above words, and there is some truth in their view. †

If निरूढलक्षणा is left out, all other varieties of लक्षणा are found to proceed from a definite purpose or motive and are, therefore, collectively termed ‘ प्रयोजनवती लक्षणा ’. For instance, there is a definite

---

† कुशग्राहिरूपार्थस्य व्युत्पत्तिलभ्यत्वेऽपि दक्षरूपस्यैव मुख्यार्थत्वात् । अन्यद्धि शब्दानां व्युत्पत्तिनिमित्तमन्यच्च प्रवृत्तिनिमित्तम् । –साहित्यदर्पणः, २

कुशलद्विरेफद्विकादयस्तु साक्षात्सङ्केतितविषयत्वान्मुख्या एवेति न रूढिर्लक्ष्यस्यार्थस्य हेतुत्वेनास्माभिरुक्ता । –काव्यानुशासनम्, १ (पृ. २५)

purpose of लक्षणा in the use of the sentence 'गङ्गायां घोषः' and it is in *suggesting* the *extreme* coolness and purity of the bank and of the hamlet situated on it. Although the sentence 'गङ्गातटे घोषः' is capable of suggesting these qualities, yet it is unnecessary to resort to लक्षणा in it. Moreover, the excess or *abundance* of these qualities is not so much suggested by the word 'तट' in the sentence 'गङ्गातटे घोषः' as it is done by the peculiar mode of the word 'गङ्गा' in 'गङ्गायां घोषः'. The word 'गङ्गा' can imply not only 'the bank' but can also suggest a third sense, viz., 'coolness and sanctity' (शैत्यपावनत्व) of गङ्गा in an excessive degree. Thus the suggestion of the excess of 'coolness and sanctity' which really belongs to the stream, but which is transferred to 'the hamlet' (घोष) through association, is the motive or purpose of लक्षणा in the sentence 'गङ्गायां घोषः'. It may then generally be said that the definite purpose of प्रयोजनवती लक्षणा is to help the process of suggestion (व्यञ्जना) and suggest a third sense, which is the same as the purpose and other than the express (वाच्य) and implied (लक्ष्य) senses. This suggestion depends, of course, upon the individual frame of mind of which one is possessed, and it is, therefore, subjective rather than objective.

Now the *mental process* involved in प्रयोजनवती लक्षणा leading to व्यञ्जना (suggestion) is this:— In all the varieties of प्रयोजनवती लक्षणा the understanding of the purpose (प्रयोजन), which is in the form of

' suggestion ', depends upon the *consciousness of identity* (अभेदप्रतिपत्ति) between the primary sense (वाच्यार्थ) and the secondary sense (लक्ष्यार्थ). This consciousness of identity leads us to *transfer* the characteristics (धर्म) of the primary sense to the secondary sense. This transfer further makes possible the *association* of those characteristics with the secondary sense, and the association then enables us to understand the *purpose* in the form of ' suggestion '. For instance, in ' गङ्गायां घोषः ' when the identity of the primary sense ' stream ' and the the secondary sense ' bank ' is realized, we transfer the characteristics of ' coolness and sanctity ' belonging to ' the stream ' to ' the bank ', and the association of ' coolness and sanctify ' with the bank makes us conscious of the purpose of लक्षणा, viz., the suggestion of ' coolness and sanctity 'attaching to the bank and the hamlet.

प्रयोजनवती लक्षणा is divided into two main varieties viz., शुद्धा (Pure) and गौणी (Qualitative). In शुद्धा लक्षणा there is the absence of 'उपचार' which, in its restricted sense, means ' the secondary use of a word ' owing to similarity between its primary sense (वाच्यार्थ) and implied sense (लक्ष्यार्थ). We must remember here that ' उपचार ' in its wider sense means the *secondary* or *figurative use of a word,* and such उपचार being present in all varieties of लक्षणा (even in शुद्धा लक्षणा) becomes an equivalent of लक्षणा, since लक्षणा also is the secondary or figurative use of a word. The word 'उपचार' in this wider sense is used

in different systems of Hindu philosophy. But the distinction between शुद्धा लक्षणा and गौणी लक्षणा without being based on this wider sense of उपचार is based on its *restricted sense.* In शुद्धा लक्षणा, therefore, the primary sense and the implied sense of a word have between themselves a relation which is other than that of similarity (सादृश्येतरसम्बन्ध). Some of the numerous relations other than the one of similarity are—(i) conjunction or association (संयोग or साहचर्य) as between ' कुन्ताः ' (lances) and ' कुन्तिनः ' (lancers) in the example ' कुन्ताः प्रविशन्ति ', (ii) proximity (सामीप्य) as between the *stream* and the *bank* in the example ' गङ्गायां घोषः ', (iii) effect and cause (कार्यकारणभाव) as between ' long life ' and ' life-prolonging property' (ghee) in the example 'आयुर्घृतम्', (iv) subserviency or serving the purpose of another (तादर्थ्यं), as between ' इन्द्र ' and the ' post (स्थूणा) serving the purpose of इन्द्र ' in the example ' यजमान इन्द्रं (स्थूणां) पूजयति ', etc.

In the other main variety of प्रयोजनवती लक्षणा, viz., the गौणी लक्षणा there is the presence of 'उपचार' in its restricted sense. In other words, there is the secondary use of a word in it owing to the *relation of similarity or extreme resemblance* (सादृश्येन सम्बन्धेन प्रवृत्तिः) between its primary sense and implied sense. ' गौणी ' (qualitative) etymologically means ' one which proceeds from qualities ' (गुणेभ्य आगता) that are common to the primary sense and the implied sense. For example, in the case of the words ' चन्द्रः ' and ' अग्निः ' that are

उपचरित or लाक्षणिक (*figuratively used*) in the sentences 'मुखं चन्द्रः' and 'माणवकः अग्निः', there is the relation of similarity between the primary senses of those words, viz., 'the moon' and 'fire', and the secondary senses of the same, viz., 'the face' and 'the boy' respectively. The identity between 'चन्द्रः and मुखम्' or 'माणवकः and अग्निः' is then felt by us owing to the *extreme resemblance of their qualities,* though the primary sense and the secondary sense of 'चन्द्रः' and 'अग्निः' are quite separate things.

There are four subdivisions of शुद्धा लक्षणा, viz., उपादान, लक्षण, सारोपा and साध्यवसाना, which are dealt with in their *order as follows*—

(i) उपादानलक्षणा (Inclusive implication), which is also called अजहत्स्वार्था or अजहल्लक्षणा, is that in which there is the *inclusion* or acceptance (उपादान) of the primary sense in the implied sense. In other words, उपादानलक्षणा is that in which the primary sense accepts an additional sense for the purpose of establishing itself (primary sense) in the context of a sentence. In this लक्षणा the primary sense of a word is not given up (न जहाति पदं स्वार्थं यस्याम्) but in combination with the additional sense it is included in the implied sense. Thus the sentences—यष्टयः (यष्टिधराः पुरुषाः) प्रविशन्ति, कुन्ताः (कुन्तिनः पुरुषाः) प्रविशन्ति, श्वेतः (अश्वः) धावति, काकेभ्यः (दध्युपघातकप्राणिभ्यः) दधि रक्ष्यताम्, छत्रिणः (छत्रिणोऽच्छत्रिणश्च) यान्ति, are all examples of the inclusion of the primary senses of the words in bold type, along with additional senses, in their implied senses.

(ii) लक्षणलक्षणा (Exclusive implication), otherwise called जहत्स्वार्था or जहल्लक्षणा, is that in which there is the *exclusion* or abandonment of the primary sense, which being incompatible with the context of a sentence *indicates* (लक्षणेन उपलक्षिता) another sense connected with it so as to suit the context of that sentence. For instance, in the sentences 'गङ्गायां (गङ्गातटे) घोषः' and 'मञ्चाः (मञ्चस्थाः बालकाः) क्रोशन्ति' (The children on the cots cry), the primary senses of the words 'गङ्गा' (stream) and 'मञ्चाः' (cots) are excluded or given up in order to point out the implied senses 'bank' and 'children on the cots' respectively.

In connection with these two sub-divisions of शुद्धा लक्षणा, an independent variety 'जहदजहल्लक्षणा' (Quasi-inclusive or partial implication), otherwise named 'भागलक्षणा' or 'भागत्यागलक्षणा', may be mentioned. Though this variety has not been recognized by the आलङ्कारिक्s or the नैयायिक्s, it is usually resorted to by the वेदान्तिन्s for establishing the identity of the Individual Soul with the Universal Soul while expounding the great Vedic dictum 'तत्त्वमसि' (Thou art That). Thus जहदजहल्लक्षणा occurs when a word signifying some qualified entity (विशिष्ट) abandons one part of its primary sense and retains another part.*

* यत्र हि विशिष्टवाचकः शब्दः एकदेशं विहाय एकदेशे वर्तते तत्र जहदजहल्लक्षणा, यथा 'सोऽयं देवदत्तः' इति। —वेदान्तपरिभाषा, प्र. ४

जहदजहतीति सा स्याद्या वाच्यार्थैकदेशमपहाय।
बोधयति चैकदेशं सोऽयं द्विज इतिवदाश्रयेदेनाम्॥

शङ्कराचार्यकृतं स्वात्मनिरूपणम्, ३५

For instance, in the sentence 'सोऽयं देवदत्तः' (This is that देवदत्त) the two qualified entities signified by the words 'सः' and 'अयम्' referring respectively to देवदत्त *of the past time* and देवदत्त *of the present time* cannot be identical. The two words, however, refer to the same विशेष्य or substantive, viz., the individual देवदत्त, who is unrelated to time, past and present. When, therefore, the identity of the qualified entities is not possible, the part consisting of attributes (विशेषण) of these entities is abandoned and the part indicating the substantive is retained or accepted. Thus the attributes or qualifications 'of the past time' and 'of the present time' being abandoned, the substantive 'देवदत्त' is retained for establishing the unity of देवदत्त. Similarly, when in the sentence 'तत्त्वमसि' [Thou (जीव) art That (ईश्वर)] we eliminate parts of the primary senses of 'Thou' and 'That', viz., the adjuncts or qualifications 'limited intelligence' (किञ्चिज्ज्ञत्व) and 'omniscience' (सर्वज्ञत्व) of जीव and ईश्वर respectively, Pure Consciousness common to जीव and ईश्वर is left, and the difference between both of them being annihilated, the identity of both is established.

(iii) Now सारोपा लक्षणा (Superimponent Implication), the third sub-division of शुद्धा as recognized by the आलङ्कारिकs, involves the process of superimposition (आरोप) of one thing on the other. The सारोपा लक्षणा, therefore, occurs when the object of superimposition (विषय–आरोपाश्रय) is identified with the thing

superimposed (विषयी–आरोप्यमाण), and when both of them are *distinctly mentioned by using separate words.* In this variety of शुद्धा लक्षणा the relation between the primary sense and the implied sense of a word is other than that of similarity. For instance, in the sentence 'घृतमायुः' (Ghee is life) 'घृतम्' which is the object of superimposition is identified with 'आयुः' which is the thing superimposed, since ghee conduces to long life. Again, as there is the causal relation between the primary sense (long life) and the implied sense (life-prolonging article, i. e., ghee) of the word 'आयुः', and as both the object of super-imposition and the thing super-imposed are distinctly mentioned by using separate words, the sentence 'घृतमायुः' is an example of शुद्धसारोपा लक्षणा.

(iv) In the fourth or last sub-division of शुद्धा लक्षणा, i. e., in the साध्यवसानलक्षणा (Introsusceptive Implication) there is the introsusception or taking in (अध्यवसान) of the object of super-imposition (विषय) by the thing super-imposed (विषयी). In other words, the object of superimposition is completely swallowed (निगीर्ण) by the thing super-imposed. Hence the object of super-imposition is not expressed in a word, while only the thing superimposed is expressed by means of a word. Moreover, there is a relation other than that of similarity between the primary sense and implied sense of that word. The sentence 'आयुरेवेदम्' or 'आयुः पिबति' is an example of this शुद्धसाध्यवसानलक्षणा. Here the object of super-imposition viz., 'घृतम्' is completely

taken in (अन्तःकृत) by the thing superimposed viz., 'आयुः'; and it is only the word 'आयुः' that is expressed. Again, as already stated, there is the causal relation between the primary sense and the implied sense of the word 'आयुः'.

Now the गौणी लक्षणा has only two varieties viz , (a) सारोप and (b) साध्यवसान, and the examples of both of them are 'वाहीको गौः' and 'अयं गौः' or 'गौर्वदति' respectively. Here we identify 'वाहीकः' (विषय–उपमेय) with 'गौः' (विषयी–उपमान), as both of them possess the common qualities of 'dullness and stupidity' (जाड्यमान्द्यादि). In the first example, i. e., of the गौणी सारोप both the object of superimposition or the thing compared (विषय–उपमेय) and the thing superimposed or the standard of comparison (विषयी–उपमान) are *separately mentioned*; while in the examples of गौणसाध्यवसान they (विषय and विषयी) are *not separately mentioned*, the विषय or उपमेय being swallowed (निगीर्ण) by the विषयी or उपमान. We have already seen that the गौणी लक्षणा occurs when the primary sense (वाच्यार्थ) and the implied sense (लक्ष्यार्थ) of a लाक्षणिक word are found to possess *similar qualities* (गुण); or when there is the relation of *similarity* between the वाच्यार्थ and लक्ष्यार्थ. In other words, the primary sense is found to possess the same qualities as those possessed by the implied sense. In the sentence 'वाहीको गौः' there is the relation of similarity between the primary sense 'bull' of the उपचरित or लाक्षणिक word 'गौः' and its implied sense 'वाहीकः', since

the primary sense 'bull' possesses the same qualities of 'dullness' etc., as are possessed by the implied sense 'वाहीकः'. Thus the लाक्षणिक word 'गौः' implies 'a man possessed of dullness', i. e., 'वाहीकः' on account of similarity between 'गौः' and 'वाहीकः'. As both these words are in the same case (समानाधिकरण), they signify one and the same person and hence yield one and the same sense (एकार्थाभिधायक). Other examples of the गौणसारोपलक्षणा are 'माणवकोऽग्निः' and 'मुखं चन्द्रः' or 'मुखचन्द्र उदेति', and those of the गौणसाध्यवसानलक्षणा are 'अग्निः कुप्यति' or 'चन्द्र उदेति'. From all such examples we find that the गौणसारोपलक्षणा is at the basis of the figure रूपक and the गौणसाध्यवसानलक्षणा is at the basis of अतिशयोक्ति, otherwise called रूपकातिशयोक्ति. In both the गौणसारोपा and गौणसाध्यवसाना we seek to suggest the identity of the विषय (उपमेय) with the विषयी (उपमान). But in the गौणसारोपा the extreme similarity between the विषय and the विषयी leads us to realize the identity of both, though they are mentioned separately; while in the गौणसाध्यवसाना the sense of similarity reaches such a point that the विषय is thought to be the विषयी itself. This is why the word standing for the विषय is swallowed and hence not expressed.

Authors like कुमारिल distinguish गौणी वृत्ति from लक्षणा by saying that लक्षणा occurs when there is the apprehension of the secondary sense which is *merely connected* with the primary sense, i. e., when the connection between the primary sense and the

implied sense is other than that of similarity; and that गौणी वृत्ति occurs when the connection between the वाच्यार्थ and लक्ष्यार्थ is through the *qualities* of the thing implied, i. e., when there is the *connection of similarity* between वाच्यार्थ and लक्ष्यार्थ.$ The examples of गौणी वृत्ति usually quoted are 'माणवकोऽग्निः', 'देवदत्तः सिंहः' etc. In these examples the primary senses of 'अग्निः' and 'सिंहः' are 'fire' and 'lion' respectively. As these senses are incompatible with the Purport of the sentences, i. e., as the primary senses of these words cannot be properly connected with 'माणवकः' and 'देवदत्तः' respectively, we have to resort to लक्षणा. Now the implied senses of 'अग्निः' and 'सिंहः' are respectively 'a boy with the qualities of fire (brightness, etc.)' and 'देवदत्त possessing the qualities of a lion (bravery, etc.)'. Thus the connection between 'माणवकः and अग्निः' or 'देवदत्तः and सिंहः' is established through their *common qualities*. But, as has already been shown, this गौणी वृत्ति of कुमारिल is the same as the गौणी लक्षणा of मम्मट, and the लक्षणा of the former is nothing but the शुद्धा लक्षणा of the latter. Thus मम्मट takes गौणी वृत्ति to be a division of लक्षणा and not an independent function as कुमारिल does. It is, therefore, unnecessary to hold लक्षणा and गौणी वृत्ति to be separate functions.

$ अभिधेयाविनाभूतप्रतीतिर्लक्षणोच्यते ।
लक्ष्यमाणगुणैर्योगाद् वृत्तेरिष्टा तु गौणता ॥

Quoted in the काव्यप्रकाश from the तन्त्रवार्तिक.

It has already been shown that the consciousness of identity (अभेदप्रतिपत्ति) between the primary sense and the implied sense of a लाक्षणिक word is indispensable to the understanding of the *purpose* (प्रयोजन) of all the varieties of प्रयोजनवती लक्षणा viz., शुद्धा and गौणी. This means that the feeling of identity leading to the understanding of the purpose is as much necessary in the case of उपादानलक्षणा and लक्षणलक्षणा as it is in the case of the सारोप and साध्यवसान varieties of both शुद्धालक्षणा and गौणलक्षणा. Generally the purpose of लक्षणा being closely related to the primary sense is felt by us in *association with* the implied sense. We must, therefore, realize the identity between the primary sense and the implied sense in order that the characteristics of the former should be associated with the latter. But mere perception of the relation between the primary sense and the implied sense cannot make us alive to the *Purpose*. For example, the sentence ' गङ्गातटे घोष: ' does not suggest the Purpose in the form of ' coolness and sanctity ' that are associated with the bank, even though we can perceive the relation between ' गङ्गा ' and ' तट '. On the other hand, in the sentence ' गङ्गायां घोष: ', which is an example of लक्षणलक्षणा, the लाक्षणिक word ' गङ्गा ' helps us to feel the identity between it's primary sense 'stream' and the *implied* sense ' bank '; and this feeling of indentity further becomes a step to the *Suggestion of the Purpose* viz., ' coolness and sanctity ' in association with the bank

and the hamlet situated on it. Coolness and sanctity are really the characteristics of the 'stream' and not of the 'bank'. When, however, the identity between the primary sense 'stream' and the implied sense 'bank' is felt by us, these characteristics can be associated with the bank. Similarly, in the sentence 'कुन्ताः प्रविशन्ति', which is an example of उपादान लक्षणा, the feeling of identity between the primary sense (lances) of the word 'कुन्ताः' and its implied sense (lancers) becomes a step to the understanding of the Purpose, which is to *suggest* the sharpness and harshness of lancers. This purpose is understood, when, after the consciousness of identity between 'lances' and 'lancers', we associate the characteristics of sharpness etc., really belonging to 'lances' (primary sense) with 'lancers' (implied sense). Thus even in उपादानलक्षणा and लक्षणलक्षणा, the varieties of शुद्धा, we must feel identity between the primary sense and the implied sense. Yet in both these varieties of शुद्धा the identity between the वाच्यार्थ and लक्ष्यार्थ is not prominently felt by us until we begin to think of the Purpose, which is other than that identity. Hence the identity in उपादानलक्षणा and लक्षणलक्षणा being indirectly felt becomes a step to the understanding of the Purpose.

Now the *Purpose* in 'घृतमायुः', which is an example of शुद्धसारोपलक्षणा, is the *suggestion* that ghee is superior to the other articles of food in bringing about its desired result (अन्यवैलक्षण्येन कार्यकारित्वम्); while in 'आयुः पिबति', which is an example of शुद्ध-

साध्यवसानलक्षणा, the purpose is the *suggestion* that ghee invariably brings about its desired result (अव्यभिचारेण कार्यकारित्वम्), since complete identity between ghee and life is shown through the intro-susception(अध्यवसान) of the word ' घृतम् ' by the word ' आयुः '. In both these varieties of शुद्धा, the super-imposition (आरोप) in ' घृतमायुः ' and the introsuception (अध्यवसान) in ' आयुः पिबति ' make the identity between ' घृतम् ' and ' आयुः ' more perceptible than that in उपादानलक्षणा and लक्षणलक्षणा.

On the other hand, in गौणसारोपलक्षणा the purpose is the apprehension of identity between the विषय and the विषयी, even though the distinction between the two is felt by us owing to their separate mention. For example, in the sentence ' वाहीको गौः ' the difference between 'वाहीकः' (विषय) and ' गौः ' (विषयी) can be observed by us on account of the distinct mention of the two. In spite of this difference the identity of the two is felt by us in consequence of the same case-relation (सामानाधिकरण्य) of those two words. This consciousness of identity between the विषय and the विषयी, in spite of their difference, is itself the Purpose of गौणसारोपलक्षणा in all its examples like ' वाहीको गौः ', ' मुखं चन्द्रः ', ' माणवकोऽग्निः ' etc. Again, in गौणसाध्यवसान-लक्षणा the Purpose is the apprehension of *complete identity* between the विषय and the विषयी on account of the introsusception of the former by the latter. For instance, in the sentence ' गौर्वदति ' complete identity between ' वाहीकः ' and ' गौः ' is felt, since the विषय

(वाहीकः) has been swallowed by the विषयी (गौः). This consciousness of *complete identity* between the विषय and the विषयी is itself the purpose of गौणसाध्यवसानलक्षणा in all its examples like 'गौर्वदति', 'चन्द्र उदेति', 'अग्निः कुप्यति' etc. Thus the purposes of गौणसारोपलक्षणा and गौणसाध्यवसानलक्षणा are common to all their respective examples, since the गौणी लक्षणा in general proceeds from the *relation of similarity* alone.†

Although the consciousness of identity (अभेद-प्रतिपत्ति) between the primary sense and the implied sense is a necessary factor common to all varieties of प्रयोजनवती लक्षणा, a distinction between शुद्धा लक्षणा and गौणी लक्षणा may be observed. While the sense of identity in शुद्धा लक्षणा is only *a step* or *means* to the understanding of the Purpose which is different from that identity, the sense of identity itself in गौणी लक्षणा becomes the Purpose. In other words, the identity in शुद्धा is *indirectly felt* and has to be apprehended for the sake of the Purpose, which is something else; while the identity in गौणी लक्षणा is prominently or *directly felt* and itself occupies the position of the Purpose. A still more subtle distinction between उपादानलक्षणा and लक्षणलक्षणा on the one hand and सारोपलक्षणा and साध्यवसानलक्षणा on the other, may be noted that in the former the sense of identity being indirectly felt becomes a step to the apprehension of the Purpose; while in the latter the sense of

†अत्र गौणभेदयोर्भेदेऽपि ताद्रूप्यप्रतीतिः सर्वथैवाभेदावगमश्च प्रयोजनम् । शुद्धभेदयोस्त्वन्यवैलक्षण्येन अव्यभिचारेण च कार्यकारित्वम् ।–काव्यप्रकाशः, उ.२.

identity being directly felt occupies the position of the Purpose on account of the process of superimposition (आरोप) and introsusception (अध्यवसान).

XVI. SUGGESTION (व्यञ्जना)

We have seen that every variety of the प्रयोजनवती लक्षणा is accompanied by a purpose (प्रयोजन) which being different from the communication of 'the primary sense' and 'the implied sense' is understood through the process of *Suggestion* (व्यञ्जना). In the sentence 'गङ्गायां घोषः' the primary sense of the word 'गङ्गा' is 'the stream' and its implied sense is 'the bank'; but the peculiar use of the लाक्षणिक word 'गङ्गा' in the sentence enables us to understand the additional sense 'coolness and sanctity', which is other than the primary and implied ones, and which is, therefore, conveyed to us through no other process than that of Suggestion. This suggested sense becomes manifest to us when we understand the speaker's *purpose* or *intention*, which is to suggest that the pleasant properties of 'coolness and sanctity' really belonging to the stream are associated with or possessed by the bank. Hence the suggested sense which itself is the purpose of लक्षणा is different from the primary sense 'stream' and the implied sense 'bank'. Thus for understanding the Purpose of the speaker we must

postulate a third function called 'व्यञ्जना' or 'ध्वनि' (Suggestion) in addition to the functions of अभिधा (Expression) and लक्षणा (Implication). Unless the Purpose contains a beautiful idea, the suggested sense is not prominently felt by us in poetry. The speaker's purpose in using the sentence 'गङ्गायां घोषः' is to suggest 'the extreme coolness and sanctity of the bank' and unlike the primary sense and the implied sense this suggested sense contains *a delightful idea*, which appeals to our *emotions* rather than to our Reason. This beautiful sense or purpose is, therefore, conveyed to us by the only process of व्यञ्जना, which is *the mental process of the pleasant and immediate association of ideas* apart from words. The purpose of the speaker is sometimes to convey his ideas directly through Expression (अभिधा) and sometimes he skilfully conceals that purpose in such a way that it should be circumstantially realized by the hearer. This is why the purpose containing a beautiful idea is *suggested* rather than expressed. Hence the suggested sense (ध्वनि), which is superior to the expressed and implied senses, is held to be the distinguishing mark of excellent poetry.

Western psychologists include 'Suggestion under 'Mimesis' which means 'imitation' in a wider sense. In the psychology of the group 'mimesis' is said to be a manifestation of the gregarious (social) instinct, the three aspects of which are 'sympathy', 'suggestion' and 'imitation'. 'Sympathy' is imitation in *feeling*, 'Suggestion' is

imitation in *ideas or thought*, and 'imitation' in its narrow sense is imitation in *action*. When two or more persons come together so as to form 'a psychological group', these three aspects of 'mimesis' are set in motion. These three aspects are so closely related to one another, that when one aspect is at work, another is aroused, because there is close relation between subtle suggestion and feeling. These aspects stand both on the instinctive (unwitting) as well as conscious levels. Of them Suggestion is the unwitting acceptance of the ideas of others. McDougall defines Suggestion as "a process of communication resulting in the acceptance with conviction of the communicated proposition in the absence of logically adequate grounds for its acceptance."$ As suggestion is unwitting in the case of the person who accepts the ideas, the instinct of 'submission' is aroused in him; while in the superior person who suggests the ideas, the process of suggestion may be conscious or deliberate. If we apply these psychological facts to a good poet and his reader, we find that the poet, who has an artistic or literary interest in Suggestion, consciously or purposefully suggests beautiful ideas, though while actually composing poetry he forgets himself and is one with the emotions and ideas, the 'constructive instinct' being aroused in him; while in the reader who appreciates or admires his ideas unwittingly or without logical discrimination, the instincts of 'submission' and

$ An Introduction to Social Psychology by McDougall, p. 83.

'curiosity' are awakened. Thus the process of suggestion working in the poet as well as in the reader being closely related to Feeling gives rise to the feelings of *Sympathy* and admiration in the latter.

The Sanskrit term for Suggestion in poetry is 'ध्वनि' which is used by आनन्दवर्धन, the first exponent of the ध्वनि-theory, in his ध्वन्यालोक. It is, he says, borrowed from the grammarians, who, as we have already seen, employ it for the audible and non-eternal sounds (ध्वनि) that *suggest* the eternal स्फोट.$ Although the ध्वनिवादिन्s do not recognize the theory of स्फोट on account of their acceptance of the suggestiveness of words as well as their parts, yet by the analogy of the *suggestiveness* of non-eternal words as held by the grammarians, they employ the term 'ध्वनि' to connote the wider significance of the suggestiveness of *words* as well as their *senses*. Thus the term 'ध्वनि' of the ध्वनिवादिन्s widely includes its various connotations, viz., suggestive words, their expressed senses which are suggestive, suggested sense, function of suggestion, and suggestive poetry. As in all good poetry prominence is found to be given to the ध्वनि or व्यङ्ग्यार्थ (suggested sense) in relation to which a word and its expressed sense occupy a subordinate position, आनन्दवर्धन establishes

---

$ ते (वैयाकरणाः) च श्रूयमाणेषु वर्णेषु ध्वनिरिति व्यवहरन्ति। तथैवान्यैस्तन्मतानुसारिभिः सूरिभिः काव्यतत्त्वार्थदर्शिभिर्वाच्यवाचकसंमिश्रः शब्दात्मा काव्यमिति व्यपदेशो व्यञ्जकत्वसाम्याद् ध्वनिरित्युक्तः।

(ध्वन्यालोकः, १।१६).

the *synthetic principle of criticism that* ध्वनि *is the soul of poetry.* † Further, this ध्वनि-theory naturally leads आनन्दवर्धन and his illustrious commentator अभिनवगुप्त to the *psychological exposition of the theory of* रस. They, therefore, establish the aesthetic principle that रसध्वनि (suggestion of sentiments) is the foremost of all the varieties of ध्वनि, and that अलङ्कार (figures of speech), गुण (excellences), रीति (style), वस्तु (plot), etc., must all subserve the main purpose of the development of रस. This is predominantly *a synthetic method of the criticism of literature.*

Now the suggested sense (ध्वनि or व्यङ्ग्यार्थ) cannot be conveyed by the power of अभिधा (Expression). For, the अभिधा establishes a direct and conventional relation between an already existing thing and the words denoting it; and after it has performed its function of denoting one conventional sense, it is exhausted.* A separate function must, therefore, be postulated for the purpose of conveying a sense other than the primary or conventional one; and it is performed by the suggestive power residing in the expressed sense of words. Hence we find that the suggested sense is indirectly related to words; and if it is supposed that it is directly related, the existence of a sense other than the primary one

† यत्रार्थः शब्दो वा तमर्थमुपसर्जनीकृतस्वार्थौ । व्यङ्क्तः काव्यविशेषः स ध्वनिरिति सूरिभिः कथितः ॥ (ध्वन्यालोकः, १।१३).

* विशेष्यं नाभिधा गच्छेत् क्षीणशक्तिर्विशेषणे । –काव्यप्रकाशः, २।५

would never be possible.† If thus the suggestive power resides in the expressed sense of words, the suggested sense cannot be apprehended by us unless we first know the whole expressed sense and the words denoting it.$ At such places the expressed sense of words with their various aspects, viz., their syllables, order, etc., becomes instrumental to the apprehension of the suggested sense which is principal. Here the expressed sense without being cancelled helps the manifestation of the suggested sense. The variety of ध्वनि that occurs in this case is called 'विवक्षितान्यपरवाच्य' (in which the expressed sense is meant for the sake of another-suggested-sense) or 'अभिधामूल' (based on Expression). It may be noted that in this variety of ध्वनि the suggested sense is indirectly related to words. The subdivisions of this variety of ध्वनि are 'संलक्ष्यक्रमव्यङ्ग्य' and 'असंलक्ष्यक्रमव्यङ्ग्य' or 'रसध्वनि'. The *mental process* involved in both is this:—In the former the graded steps of realizing the suggested sense from the expressed sense can be well ascertained; whereas in the latter the understanding of the expressed sense in the form of the representation of the विभावs (causes of emotions or determinants), अनुभावs (after-effects of emotions or consequents)

---

† वाच्यो ह्यर्थः साक्षाच्छब्दस्य सम्बन्धी। तदितरस्त्वभिधेयसामर्थ्याक्षितः सम्बन्धिसम्बन्धी। यदि च स्वसम्बन्धित्वं साक्षात्तस्य स्यात्, तदाऽर्थान्तरव्यवहार एव न स्यात्। —ध्वन्यालोकः, ३।३३

$ वाच्यार्थप्रतीतिपूर्विका व्यङ्ग्यार्थस्य प्रतिपत्तिः।— ध्वन्यालोकः, १।१०

and व्यभिचारिभावs (transient emotions)§ awakens without well discernible steps or immediately the स्थायिभावs (permanent moods) latent in us, and instantly gives rise to the रस which is the suggested sense. Although there are some intermediate steps *between the understanding of the expressed sense* and the realization of the रस here, yet the process takes place so quickly that the steps cannot be perceived, and the suggestion of the रस appears to be instantaneous. †

An example of the संलक्ष्यक्रमव्यङ्ग्य is found in the sixth canto of the कुमारसम्भव. When the divine sages approached the father of पार्वती and when अङ्गिरस्, their leader, requested him to offer पार्वती in marriage to शिव, पार्वती who was inwardly delighted at this proposal, is described as follows—

एवंवादिनि देवर्षौ पार्श्वे पितुरधोमुखी ।
लीलाकमलपत्राणि गणयामास पार्वती ॥ –कुमार० ६।८४

" When the heavenly sage (अङ्गिरस्) spoke thus, पार्वती, who was by the side of her father, counted the petals of her play-lotus with a down-cast look."

Here, though पार्वती was pleased in her mind, she could not, out of bashfulness, display her love

§ Read pages 136–143.

† न हि विभावानुभावव्यभिचारिण एव रसा इति कस्यचिदवगमः । अत एव च विभावादिप्रतीत्यविनाभाविनी रसादीनां प्रतीतिरिति तत्प्रतीत्योः कार्यकारणभावेन व्यवस्थानात् क्रमोऽवश्यंभावी । स तु लाघवान्न प्रकाश्यते ' इत्यलक्ष्यक्रमा एव सन्तो व्यङ्ग्या रसादयः ' इत्युक्तम् ।

—ध्वन्यालोकः, २।२२

for शिव in the presence of the elderly persons. She, therefore, tried to conceal her feelings by pretending to count the petals with a down-cast look. Here, पार्वती's transient emotion (व्यभिचारिभाव) 'bashfulness' (लज्जा) is suggested.$ This suggestion is realized by us when, after understanding the expressed sense which is subordinated, we take into account पार्वती's former love for शिव, the mention of शिव as the proposed husband, and पार्वती's counting of petals with a down-cast look. This suggestion of the व्यभिचारिभाव appeals to us through these clearly perceptible stages and not immediately after the understanding of the expressed sense. For, the counting of petals with a down-cast look may also take place on account of circumstances other than bashfulness. Thus in order to realize the suggestion of this bashfulness we have to undergo the stages, viz., पार्वती's love for शिव, her penance, शिव's mention, etc.

An example of the असंलक्ष्यक्रमव्यङ्ग्य occurs in the third canto of the कुमारसम्भव. In the former part of this canto the following incidents have been described. मदन in order to excite the love of शिव for पार्वती goes with his friend वसन्त (the Vernal Season) to the place where शिव is practising penance. पार्वती, who is in the prime of her youth, is attending upon शिव out of love for him. She offers to शिव a rosary of

---

$ अत्र हि लीलाकमलपत्रगणनमुपसर्जनीकृतस्वरूपं शब्दव्यापारं विनैवार्थान्तरं व्यभिचारिभावलक्षणं प्रकाशयति । —ध्वन्यालोकः, २।२३

अभिधा is generally related to one object; yet in the Sanskrit language we usually meet with words having the same form but possessing more primary senses than one, as they are related to more objects than one. For instance, words like कर, मधु, नग, मित्र, पयोधर, etc., possess more primary senses than one owing to their reference to more objects than one. The existence of such words in Sanskrit has led Sanskrit poets to use the श्लेषालङ्कार to such an extent that they have missed the real purpose of poetry and have made it artificial. A 'श्लेष' generally occurs when a writer intends to convey two or more primary senses of a word. But when out of many primary senses of a word only one is intended to be conveyed on account of the presence of the following factors restricting that particular sense, we apprehend the primary senses, not intended to be conveyed, by the process of *Suggestion*. It is, therefore, said that when there is a doubt with respect to the sense of a word which has more senses than one, the causes that lead to the restriction of a particular sense out of many are—(1) संयोगः–conjunction or existence of a well-known and general connection between two things, (2) विप्रयोगः–disjunction or the loss of that connection, (3) साहचर्यम्–mutual association or companionship, (4) विरोधिता– well-known hostility, (5) अर्थः–motive or purpose, (6) प्रकरणम्– context, (7) लिङ्गम्– a special attribute or characteristic, (8) शब्दस्यान्यस्य संनिधिः– proximity of another word, (9) सामर्थ्यम्–power that has already

manifested its result, (10) औचित्ती–propriety or fitness, (11) देशः–place, (12) कालः–time, (13) व्यक्तिः–gender, (14) स्वरः–accent or change of voice, and others, i. e., अभिनय (gestures), अपदेश (pointing out directly or making definite by gestures), etc.$ This suggestion of another primary sense of a word in consequence of its restricted sense is called 'अभिधामूलव्यञ्जना'. Here the restricted sense is understood by the power of अभिधा and the other sense, though a primary one occurs to us by the process of Suggestion. This अभिधामूलव्यञ्जना (Suggestion based upon Expression) along with लक्षणामूलव्यञ्जना (Suggestion based upon Implication) is called 'शाब्दी', as the particular words used in it are more important than their sense, i. e., the words are incapable of being changed by the use of synonyms (पर्यायपरिवृत्त्यसह).

It is not, however, always true that Suggestion solely depends upon words; for, even in the absence of words merely the melody of music, gestures, etc., the sense of which is not fixed but varied, are suggestive of sentiments or the inner motive.* Again, the अभिधा power is limited to a particular object or objects, while the suggested sense assumes varied forms according to the speciality of the speaker,

---

$ See the काव्यप्रकाश (२।१४), the साहित्यदर्पण (२।१४), and the quotation 'संयोगो विप्रयोगश्च' etc., with the respective illustrations of each factor.

* अवाचकस्यापि गीतशब्दादे रसादिलक्षणार्थावगमदर्शनात्, अशब्दस्यापि चेष्टादेरर्थविशेषप्रकाशनासिद्धेः। –(ध्व. ३।३३).

the power of व्यञ्जना alone. But even in the absence of the three conditions of लक्षणा, the word 'गङ्गा' itself is not unable to communicate the प्रयोजन 'coolness and sanctity', which is conveyed by the independent function of व्यञ्जना.$ The function of लक्षणा ceases after conveying the implied sense 'bank'; and the प्रयोजन in the form of 'coolness and sanctity' can be apprehended by व्यञ्जना alone. व्यञ्जना may sometimes depend upon लक्षणा as in the case of 'लक्षणामूलव्यञ्जना' (suggestion based upon Implication); yet व्यञ्जना is not the same as लक्षणा which, just like अभिधा, is only a means to the apprehension of the suggested sense.

Some ancient आलङ्कारिकs identify ध्वनि (व्यञ्जना) with भक्ति (लक्षणा), and deny the existence of the former. 'भक्ति' is to be understood here in the sense of 'उपचार',* which in its restricted sense means 'the secondary use of a word proceeding from extreme similarity.' This भक्ति or गुणवृत्ति (secondary function) is, therefore, the same as the गौणी लक्षणा (Qualitative Implication) formerly dealt with. Both भक्ति (गौणलक्षणा) and लक्षणा or शुद्धलक्षणा (Pure Implication) can thus be included under the general term 'लक्षणा' and can be

$ (अ) लक्ष्यं न मुख्यं नाप्यत्र बाधो योगः फलेन नो।
न प्रयोजनमेतस्मिन्न च शब्दः स्खलद्गतिः ॥–काव्यप्रकाशः, २।११.
(आ) मुख्यां वृत्तिं परित्यज्य गुणवृत्त्यार्थदर्शनम्।
यदुद्दिश्य फलं, तत्र शब्दो नैव स्खलद्गतिः ॥ –ध्व. १।२०.

* उपचारमात्रं तु भक्तिः। ध्व. १।१७.

differentiated from व्यञ्जना. आनन्दवर्धन says here that लक्षणा and ध्वनि differ from each other with regard to their nature and subject-matter. The difference in their nature is that लक्षणा is the process of understanding the secondary sense of a word after *cancelling* its primary sense; while व्यञ्जना is the process of apprehending the suggested sense, which being the principal one does not necessarily discard the primary sense of a word. For, the sense derived from the suggestion of रस, etc., can never be a secondary one. Again, as लक्षणा is based only on the primary sense of a word, it is, as some people say, *merely* an extension or tail of Expression (अभिधापुच्छ); while ध्वनि, which depends only upon the suggestiveness of words, is quite different from their expressiveness. § Another distinction between both of them is that in लक्षणा, when the expressed sense loses itself in favour of the secondary one, the former itself is developed into the latter and ceases there only; while in व्यञ्जना, when the expressed sense suggests another sense, it illuminates itself as well as the suggested sense, just as a lamp illuminates itself and other objects.$ For instance, the expressed sense of the verse 'लीलाकमलपत्राणि गणयामास पार्वती' makes itself known to us and suggests

---

§ वाचकत्वाश्रयेणैव गुणवृत्तिर्व्यवस्थिता।
व्यञ्जकत्वैकमूलस्य ध्वनेः स्याल्लक्षणं कथम् ॥—ध्व. १।२१.

$ व्यञ्जकत्वमार्गे तु यदाऽर्थोऽर्थान्तरं द्योतयति, तदा स्वरूपं प्रकाशयन्नेवासावन्यस्य प्रकाशकः प्रतीयते प्रदीपवत्। —ध्व. ३।३३.

the bashfulness of पार्वती. Here the expressed sense, without being discarded, is suggestive of the other sense of bashfulness. If it is supposed to be understood by Implication, there would be the contingency of taking the subordinate function of लक्षणा to be the principal one. For, sentences generally possess an independent *synthetic sense* apart from the expressed senses of individual words, which light up that synthetic sense. The expressed sense can become suggestive only when words are modified by the peculiarity of the speaker, context, and the like. The suggested sense thus aided by words becomes prominent and principal. Yet this principal sense yielded by the function of Suggestion cannot be identified with the primary sense, which is yielded by the function of अभिधा. For, अभिधा is based upon convention, while व्यञ्जना depends upon the peculiarity of the speaker, etc., and reveals a unique sense.

Even the topics of लक्षणा and व्यञ्जना are manifestly different. The subject-matter of लक्षणा is only an ordinary fact (वस्तु) which is understood after cancelling the primary sense and making the implied sense compatible with the senses of other words in a sentence. On the other hand, there are three topics that come under the domain of व्यञ्जना, viz., रसs, particular अलङ्कारs and वस्तु that can be *suggested* rather than implied. The suggested sense is, therefore, that which is not derived from the cancellation of the primary sense, which

is not conventional, and which is distinct from any other sense. It is impossible to say that the realization of रस and others is a secondary function like that of लक्षणा. The suggested sense is likewise that which, incapable of being conveyed by words, is desired to be communicated for the purpose of realizing its inherent charm. In other words, ध्वनि consists in the prominent manifestation of a charming sense that cannot be conveyed by any means other than suggestive words.† It should be incidentally noted that a slight concealment and suggestion of the poet's purpose lend charm to his poetry.§ It cannot be said that all this charm comes within the purview of लक्षणा. For, भक्ति or लक्षणा is found to be employed even when the suggested sense is not charming or is not meant to be conveyed. All examples of the secondary use of words proceeding from रूढि, as 'लावण्यम्', 'कर्मणि कुशलः', 'कलिङ्गः साहसिकः', 'ग्रामः पलायितः', etc., do not contain any purpose. Even though in examples like 'श्वेतो धावति', 'कुन्ताः प्रविशन्ति', 'मञ्चाः क्रोशन्ति' some purpose may be detected, yet that purpose does not comprise any beautiful idea. Poets are also found to make a secondary use of words without any special purpose of *suggesting* a charming idea. For instance, in the line, 'कृशाङ्ग्याः सन्तापं वदति बिसिनीपत्रशयनम्' [The bed of lotus-leaves *speaks for*, i. e., shows the torment of

---

† उक्त्यन्तरेणाशक्यं यत् तच्चारुत्वं प्रकाशयन् ।
शब्दो व्यञ्जकतां बिभ्रद् ध्वन्युक्तेर्विषयी भवेत् ॥ –ध्व. १।१८.

§ अर्थो गिरामपिहितः पिहितश्च कश्चित् । सौभाग्यमेति मरहट्टवधूकुचाभः ॥

the lady with a slender frame] the secondary use of the word 'कृश' does not suggest a specially charming idea. In all these cases लक्षणा is employed even in the absence of a special purpose. It can, therefore, be clearly distinguished from व्यञ्जना.

Although व्यञ्जना is thus distinct from अभिधा and लक्षणा, it depends upon both of them. Suggestiveness sometimes rests on the expressiveness of words, as in the variety of ध्वनि called 'विवक्षितान्यपरवाच्य', where, as we have already seen, there is no scope for लक्षणा; and sometimes it resorts to the secondary significance of words, as in the other variety of ध्वनि named 'अविवक्षितवाच्य', where the expressed sense is not desired to be communicated and is hence discarded. This latter variety of ध्वनि is, therefore, otherwise termed 'लक्षणामूलव्यञ्जना' or Suggestion based upon Implication.

The following verse is an example of the अविवक्षितवाच्यध्वनि or लक्षणामूलव्यञ्जना—

सुवर्णपुष्पं पृथिवीं चिन्वन्ति पुरुषास्त्रयः ।
शूरश्च कृतविद्यश्च यश्च जानाति सेवितुम् ॥

"Three persons gather gold flowers from the extensive earth—the brave, the learned and one who knows how to serve."

As gold flowers cannot be found on the earth, the word 'सुवर्णपुष्पम्' here is incompatible with the sense of 'gathering'. The primary sense of that word not being meant here (अविवक्षितवाच्य) is to be dropped in favour of another sense bearing resemblance to it, viz., 'abundant wealth'.

This suggestion, therefore, depends upon लक्षणा on the word 'सुवर्णपुष्पम्'.

Another example of the same variety is—

धृतिः क्षमा दया शौचं कारुण्यं वागनिष्ठुरा ।
मित्राणां चानभिद्रोहः सप्तैताः समिधः श्रियः ॥

"Fortitude, forgiveness, mercy, purity of mind, compassion, gentle words and non-injury to friends-these seven are the *sacrificial fuel* of wealth."

Here, the primary sense of the word 'समिधः' (fuel) is incompatible with 'wealth', because wealth can neither be increased by fuel nor can it blaze like fire. The literal sense is, therefore, to be dropped and another sense similar to it, viz., 'that which increases or promotes' is to be understood from the word 'समिधः' so as to suit the context, just as we do in the example 'आयुर्घृतम्'. This suggestion, which is realized by us from the word 'समिधः', is based upon लक्षणा. The word 'समिधः' again suggests one more happy idea that wealth must be acquired by fair means and used for good purposes, just as the sacred fire kindled with sacrificial sticks is to be kept up for holy purposes.

The अविवक्षितवाच्यध्वनि is further classified into two sub-divisions, viz., अत्यन्ततिरस्कृतवाच्य and अर्थान्तर-सङ्क्रमितवाच्य. In the former, the primary sense of a word being incompatible is *completely discarded* in favour of some suggested sense; while in the latter, the primary sense, though not incompatible with the context, is transferred to the suggestion of

some other beautiful sense. The following verse, which describes राम's affliction caused by his separation from सीता, is an example of both these subdivisions. राम says—

स्निग्धश्यामलकान्तिलिप्तवियतो वेल्लद्बलाका घनाः
वाताः शीकरिणः पयोदसुहृदामानन्दकेकाः कलाः ।
कामं सन्तु दृढं कठोरहृदयो रामोऽस्मि सर्वं सहे
वैदेही तु कथं भविष्यति हहा हा देवि धीरा भव ॥

—ध्वन्यालोकः, २

"Let there be clouds that have *besmeared* (pervaded) the sky with their oily and dark-blue lustre and that have cranes moving about sportively in them; let there be winds mixed with water-drops; let there be the joyful and sweet cries of the *friends* of clouds (peacocks). I, hard-hearted *Rama*, can bear all this; but what will be the condition of वैदेही now? Alas! Oh lady, have courage!"

In this verse the primary sense of the word 'लिप्त' (besmeared) has to be discarded completely and the other qualitatively similar sense 'व्याप्त' (pervaded) has to be understood in its stead, since it is impossible to besmear the formless sky with anything. Again, as it is impossible to have friendship with inanimate clouds, the expressed sense of 'सुहृदाम्' (*friends*) has to be abandoned completely and the other sense 'peacocks' has to be understood on account of the connection of 'सुहृदाम्' with 'केका' (the cry of a peacock). Thus the suggestion of the other senses is awakened in us when the expressed senses of 'लिप्त' and 'सुहृद्' are

completely discarded (अत्यन्ततिरस्कृतवाच्य). But in the use of the word 'राम' there is the suggestion called 'अर्थान्तरसङ्क्रमितवाच्य'. The expressed sense of the word 'राम' is 'the son of दशरथ,' and this sense is not incompatible with the context. Yet the propriety of that word is understood when we transfer this expressed sense to the realization of the suggested sense, viz., 'राम who is patient in spite of the calamities of forest life'. When this sense appeals to us, we know why राम can stand all the sights and sounds of the rainy season, though they are excitant of his emotion of love for सीता.

आनन्दवर्धन recognizes the fact that his predecessors like उद्भट and वामन slightly touched the principle of ध्वनि. For, they admit that भक्ति, a variety of लक्षणा, is based upon the relation of extreme resemblance or identity between the expressed sense and the secondary sense, and hence conduces much to poetic charm.$ Thus भक्ति, otherwise called 'वक्रोक्ति' by वामन,* is found to stand just on the border of ध्वनि. Yet आनन्दवर्धन contends that these predecessors could not define this poetic mode in precise terms, and erred in taking it to be a second-

$ यद्यपि च ध्वनिशब्दसंकीर्तनेन काव्यलक्षणविधायिभिर्गुणवृत्तिरन्यो वा न कश्चित्प्रकारः प्रकाशितः, तथापि अमुख्यवृत्त्या काव्येषु व्यवहारं दर्शयता ध्वनिमार्गो मनाक्स्पृष्टोऽपि न लक्षित इति परिकल्प्यैवमुक्तम्– 'भाक्तमाहुस्तमन्ये' इति। –ध्व. १।१.

* सादृश्याल्लक्षणा वक्रोक्तिः। (वामन–काव्यालङ्कारसूत्रम् ४।३।८).

signification without the above qualification of 'suggestiveness', since the latter does not yield a suggested sense, which would gladden the hearts of connoisseurs. [ध्वन्यालोकः, उद्योत १ and ३]

व्यञ्जना should also be distinguished from तात्पर्य. तात्पर्यवृत्ति, as has formerly been shown, is postulated by the अभिहितान्वयवादिन्s for the purpose of understanding the synthetic sense of a whole sentence, and is held to be a function distinct from अभिधा and लक्षणा, which are concerned with individual words. The powers of अभिधा and लक्षणा, they say, are exhausted after yielding the expressed and implied senses of individual words. Hence the logical connection (अन्वय) of words in the form of the unified sense of a sentence is established, according to the अभिहितान्वयवादिन्s, by the separate power of तात्पर्य. The sense of a sentence (वाक्यार्थ) is principal (पर) in relation to the words contained in it, and words achieving that principal object (तत्पर=वाक्यार्थपर) are shown to have a logical relation among them on account of आकाङ्क्षा, योग्यता and संनिधि by the separate function of तात्पर्य. The generic senses of individual words are then turned into the specific sense of a sentence, which emerges from the intention or purpose of the speaker (वक्तुरिच्छा तात्पर्यम्). The अभिहितान्वयवादिन्s, therefore, assert that the purpose of the speaker is conveyed by the तात्पर्यवृत्ति, and that it is unnecessary to take व्यञ्जना, which too is held to convey the

purpose, as a function separate from तात्पर्य. The rhetoricians, on the other hand, are generally unwilling to accept तात्पर्य as a separate function, and include it under the function of व्यञ्जना. This confusion about the identity of तात्पर्य and व्यञ्जना arises on account of a few common characteristics possessed by both. In the first place, both तात्पर्य and व्यञ्जना are said to manifest the purpose of the speaker. Secondly, both convey the principal sense with reference to the subordinate senses yielded by अभिधा and लक्षणा. Thirdly, both begin to function after the powers of अभिधा and लक्षणा are exhausted, though both of them depend upon अभिधा and लक्षणा. Fourthly, both are said to rely on the speciality of the speaker, context, etc., and require the aid of the determinants of the special meanings of words, viz., संयोग, विप्रयोग and others, as formerly referred to. Fifthly, both of them are found to convey the synthetic sense of a sentence, though व्यञ्जना sometimes yields the suggested sense of words and their syllables also. These common characteristics of both lead the मीमांसक्स to include व्यञ्जना in तात्पर्य and the rhetoricians to include तात्पर्य in व्यञ्जना according to the prominent part played by the word-aspect in their respective systems. मम्मट, however, seems to be the first rhetorician, who with clear insight makes a compromise between these two views. Whenever he has an occasion to refer to these two functions, he, instead of including तात्पर्य in व्यञ्जना, makes a separate mention of it along with

अभिधा, लक्षणा and व्यञ्जना.* This perhaps means that he wants to accept तात्पर्यवृत्ति, though with reservation, as a function distinct from व्यञ्जनावृत्ति. The necessity of recognizing तात्पर्यवृत्ति might have been felt by him for the reason that *it is तात्पर्यवृत्ति rather than व्यञ्जना-वृत्ति that is indispensable to the understanding of the purport of intellectual topics in शास्त्रs and prose works.* Thus with the view of reserving the province of शास्त्रs and kindred subjects for तात्पर्यवृत्ति he invariably makes a separate mention of it. On the other hand, in the case of emotional subjects like poetry he seems to think it preferable to give due importance to the function of व्यञ्जना rather than to that of तात्पर्य. *The suggested sense manifested by व्यञ्जना is prominently emotional and culminates naturally in the रसध्वनि*, as remarked above. It is, therefore, *quite necessary to distinguish this emotional process of व्यञ्जना from the intellectual one of तात्पर्य.* तात्पर्यवृत्ति can at most bind together the individual senses of words conveyed by अभिधा and लक्षणा, and can exhibit the synthetic sense or purpose of ordinary thoughts and scientific subjects which require the use of Reason for their grasp. It is,

* तात्पर्यार्थोऽपि केषुचित् (का. प्र. २।६); तदादौ ये विशेषाः पावनत्वादयस्ते चाभिधातात्पर्यलक्षणाभ्यो व्यापारान्तरेण गम्याः (का. प्र. २।२८); अभिधातात्पर्यलक्षणात्मकव्यापारत्रयातिवर्ती ध्वननादिपर्यायो व्यापारोऽनपह्नवनीय एव (का. प्र. ५।४७); इति सिद्धमभिधातात्पर्यलक्षणाव्यापारातिरिक्तं ध्वननम् (शब्दव्यापारविचारः).

however, inadequate to convey the suggested sense (ध्वनि) which awakens our emotions and Imagination, and sometimes baffles verbal expression. In the apprehension of the suggested sense we have to undergo *three or four mental stages.* The *first stage* is the recollection of the conventional or generic senses arising from words owing to the power of अभिधा. At the *second stage* the power of अभिधा being exhausted, the comprehension of the sense of the whole sentence takes place through the separate function of तात्पर्य, which establishes logical relation (संसर्ग, अन्वय) among the generic senses, transforms them into particular ones, and gives a peculiar form to the sense of the whole sentence. Thus the mutual relation, which itself assumes a peculiar form of the sense of the whole sentence owing to the तात्पर्यशक्ति, is not conveyed by the power of अभिधा, since the sense of a sentence is not the sense of individual words in it. If there is incompatibility of ascertaining the तात्पर्य, लक्षणा will perform its function, and after the removal of that incompatibility at the *third stage* the तात्पर्यार्थ will be re-established. At the last or *fourth stage* when the sense of the whole sentence is understood, i. e., when the तात्पर्यवृत्ति has exhausted its power, the suggested sense (ध्वनि) in poetry will arise. If thus the power of अभिधा is already exhausted at the second stage, how can it extend its function to the fourth stage of realizing the suggested sense ? If the function

of अभिधा is distant from the function of तात्पर्य, it is doubtless more distant from the function of व्यञ्जना which is remote from तात्पर्यवृत्ति.* It will thus be clear that the function of तात्पर्य is exhausted merely in establishing the logical connection of the expressed and implied senses of words in a sentence and can lead us no further. § It is only after we have uninterruptedly understood the sense of the whole sentence that we are enabled to realize the suggested sense. The तात्पर्य may sometimes help the manifestation of the suggested sense; yet the suggested sense is unique in comparison with the तात्पर्यार्थ, just as the तात्पर्यार्थ is a new sense in comparison with the conventional sense of a word.

The मीमांसकs specify the meaning of तात्पर्य in the following way. According to them a sentence is composed of two parts (the Subject and the Predicate) conveying respectively two kinds of sense, viz., भूत (सिद्ध) and भव्य (साध्य). The portion consisting of the Subject contains senses that are already

* अर्थशक्तिमूलेऽपि विशेषे सङ्केतः कर्तुं न युज्यते इति सामान्यरूपाणां पदार्थानामाकाङ्क्षासंनिधियोग्यतावशात्परस्परसंसर्गो यत्रापदार्थोऽपि विशेषरूपो वाक्यार्थस्तत्राभिहितान्वयवादे का वार्ता व्यङ्ग्यस्याभिधेयतायाम् । (काव्यप्रकाशः, उ. ५, झळकीकरकृता टीका). See also the प्रदीप on this.

§ विशेषरूपे वाक्यार्थे तात्पर्यशक्तिः परस्परान्विते । प्रतिपत्तिश्चान्वयस्य नाभिधाशक्त्या, तस्याः पदार्थप्रतिपत्त्युपायक्षीणाया विरम्याव्यापारादिति तात्पर्यशक्त्यैवान्वयप्रतिपत्तिः । व्यापारश्च नाभिधात्मा, समयाभावात् । न तात्पर्यात्मा, तस्यान्वयप्रतीतावेव परिक्षयात् । –ध्वन्यालोकलोचनम्, १।४.

existent (सिद्ध) or obtained from other sources; while the part representing the Predicate comprises the senses that are yet to be brought into existence (साध्य). As the former portion is already known, any predication (विधान) with respect to it is thought to be useless; while the latter portion which is yet to be known is thought to be worthy of predication (विधेय). Thus in a sentence the former portion is used for completing the sense of the latter. The तात्पर्य of a sentence is then found only in this latter portion; and only that portion which contains the तात्पर्य is determined to be the sense of the whole sentence. A sentence is always employed to convey only this sense which is not yet known by other means. The latter portion is, therefore, held to be the criterion of understanding the unknown sense of that sentence and is hence predicated. For instance, in the sentence 'दध्ना जुहोति' (He offers sacrifice with curds) the 'offering' and the 'curds' are already known from other sources of knowledge; but the instrumentality (करणत्व) of 'दधि' with respect to 'हवन' (offering) is a fact yet to be known (साध्य). The तात्पर्य of this sentence, therefore, lies only in the instrumentality which is worthy of being predicated (विधेय).* This तात्पर्य again lies only in the

* 'भूतभव्यसमुच्चारणे भूतं भव्यायोपदिश्यते' इति कारकपदार्थाः क्रियापदार्थेनान्वीयमानाः प्रधानक्रियानिर्वर्तकस्वक्रियाभिसम्बन्धात् साध्यायमानतां प्राप्नुवन्ति, ततश्चादग्धदहनन्यायेन यावदप्राप्तं तावदभिधीयते। यथा–हवनस्यान्यतः सिद्धेः 'दध्ना जुहोति' इत्यादौ दध्यादेः करणत्वमात्रं

sense of a word that is *pronounced or uttered*, and not in the sense that is known from any other relation or source of knowledge.

Of course, these peculiarities of the तात्पर्यार्थ evidently distinguish it from the suggested sense (ध्वनि) which is neither predicated nor pronounced by means of words. Again, as the expressed senses of words prominently come within the range of तात्पर्यवृत्ति, the unified sense of a sentence like 'गतोऽस्तमर्कः' (The sun is set) yielded by it admits of no difference, but is uniform and fixed in spite of the diversity of the speaker, context, etc., and if the तात्पर्यार्थ might not be uniform and fixed, the purport of ordinary statements and शास्त्रs might be wrong or unintelligible. It is, therefore, necessary for all the शास्त्रs, which involve an intellectual process of thinking and reasoning, to yield one and the same meaning under varying circumstances.† On the other hand, the *suggested sense* of the sentence 'गतोऽस्तमर्कः' can be manifold according to the diversity of the speaker, context, etc., § and this manifoldness of the suggested sense instead of falsifying

---

विधेयम् । ... 'यदेव विधेयं तत्रैव तात्पर्यम्' इत्युपात्तस्यैव शब्दस्यार्थे तात्पर्यम्, न तु प्रतीतमात्रे । –काव्यप्रकाशः, उ. ५ (झळकीकर, पृ. २२६)

† शास्त्रं हि सकृदुच्चारितं समयबलेनार्थं प्रतिपादयद्युगपद्विरुद्धानेकसमयस्मृत्ययोगात्कथमर्थद्वयं प्रत्याययेत् । अविरुद्धत्वे वा तावानेको वाक्यार्थः स्यात् । क्रमेण विरम्यव्यापारायोगः । पुनरुच्चारितेऽपि वाक्ये स एव, समयप्रकरणादेस्तादवस्थ्यात् । –ध्व. लोचनम्, १।२१.

§ See 'काव्यप्रकाश', उ. ५ (झळकीकर, पृ. २४०).

it enhances its *poetic charm.* Moreover, as we have already seen, the suggested sense, unlike the तात्पर्यार्थ, does not depend merely on words or sentences, but is manifested even by tunes and silent gestures. Thus the mental process involved in understanding the तात्पर्यार्थ is different from that involved in the realization of the व्यङ्ग्यार्थ. Although every sentence in language can be found to convey some purpose of the speaker, yet a distinction should be made between the purpose of thoughts contained in ordinary statements and शास्त्र्s on the one hand, and that of exquisite and emotional ideas in poetry on the other. The former may come within the range of तात्पर्यवृत्ति, whereas the latter deservedly belong to the domain of ध्वनि.

Now from the absolute (पारमार्थिक) point of view of the वेदान्तिन्s the whole universe is unreal and hence the relation between words and senses also is unreal. Yet, if from the phenomenal point of view (व्यावहारिकसत्ता) they accept the relative existence of words and their senses, they cannot negate the process of Suggestion. Moreover, as Suggestion is not an intellectual process, it cannot be identified with the logical process of inference (अनुमान), since no invariable concomitance (व्याप्ति) is found to exist between the suggestor (व्यञ्जक) and the suggested (व्यङ्ग्य), just as it is found between the middle term (हेतु) and the major term (साध्य). Nor can Suggestion be called a process of recollection (स्मृति); for, recollection is based upon the experiences of the

past. Memory cannot be awakened in the absence of past experiences. On the other hand, Suggestion is a process of the direct, immediate and unprecedented realization of the suggested sense which naturally culminates in the रसध्वनि (Suggestion of sentiments). Thus the existence and uniqueness of ध्वनि cannot be denied in any way, since ध्वनि is a fact belonging to the actual experience of the appreciators of poetic beauty (सहृदयs).

XVII. THE AESTHETIC EXPERIENCE.

It has been formerly shown that अभिनवगुप्त holds the रसध्वनि (suggestion of sentiments) to be the most important of all the varieties of ध्वनि. He has here made an original and substantial contribution to the theory of poetry by harmonizing the doctrine of ध्वनि with the रस-doctrine of भरत. It is भरत who first stressed the emotional aspect of the drama and treated of the psychological process of realizing रस. After him आनन्दवर्धन and particularly अभिनवगुप्त systematized and expounded in detail those psychological facts for the first time and applied them in a comprehensive manner to the theory of poetry. That भरत, आनन्दवर्धन and अभिनवगुप्त should employ psychology in the exposition of the aesthetic experience derived from literature is a fact which really redounds to the credit of their far-reaching insight, when it is

seen that the psychological treatment of literature is a tendency only recently developed in the West. It is, therefore, advisable to turn to the psychological process of realizing रस, which is held by अभिनवगुप्त to be *suggested* rather than expressed.

The theory of the aesthetic experience of रस in literature is briefly stated in the well-known aphorism of भरत, viz., 'विभावानुभावव्यभिचारिसंयोगाद्रसनिष्पत्तिः' (The union of the Excitants, the Ensuants and the Accessory Emotions leads to the manifestation of रस);§ and on account of the ambiguity of the words 'संयोग' and 'निष्पत्ति' the सूत्र has given rise to various interpretations and theories propounded by भट्टलोल्लट, श्रीशङ्कुक and भट्टनायक, the predecessors of अभिनवगुप्त.* भट्टलोल्लट, who is a मीमांसक, thinks that the correlation (संयोग) of the विभावs etc., with the रस is that of उत्पादक (cause) and उत्पाद्य (effect). He thus means 'उत्पत्ति' by the word 'निष्पत्ति' and puts forth the 'Production Theory' (उत्पत्तिवाद) of रस. श्रीशङ्कुक, a नैयायिक, holds that the relation between the विभावs etc., and the रस corresponds to the relation between the middle term (हेतु) and the major term (साध्य); in other words, the विभावs etc., are अनुमापक (the ground of inference) and the रस is अनुमाप्य (the thing to be inferred). He, therefore, means 'अनुमिति' (infer-

§ भरत–नाट्यशास्त्रम्, अ. ६. See Pages 140–144.

* See the अभिनवभारती अ. ६, the ध्वन्यालोकलोचन, उद्योत १–२, and काव्यप्रकाश, उ. ४.

and their स्थायिभाव (Sentiment) also being idealized, they identify themselves with the poetic situation through their universalized sympathy. According to भट्टनायक गुणs and अलङ्कारs in poetry help to bring about this idealization (साधारणीकरण), which, along with अभिधा inheres in poetry. (c) At the third stage, when the स्थायिभाव aided by the विभावs etc., is idealized or generalized by means of अभिधा and भावकत्व, it reaches its climax and is enjoyed by the reader or spectator as pure bliss, enlightenment and repose owing to the excess of सत्त्वगुण. This enjoyment of रस is variously named as 'भोग, भोजकत्व, भोगीकरण' etc., and is different from inference (अनुमान), reminiscence (स्मृति) and perception (प्रत्यक्ष).

An important thing to be noted here is that भट्टनायक is the first Sanskrit critic who rightly stresses the subjective aspect of रस as *the aesthetic experience of the reader or spectator* rather than that of the poet, the characters and the actors, though sentiments exist in the latter also. Again the three-fold process of अभिधा, भावकत्व (साधारणीकरण) and भोग is in consonance with modern psychology; for, the understanding of the senses of words by means of अभिधा is the process of *cognition* which subserves the idealization of emotions by the power of 'साधारणीकरण', wherein imagination plays a prominent part. The imagination of the reader bringing before his mental eye rich imagery heightens his sentiment, awakens universal sympathy and raises the sentiment to the state of aesthetic pleasure.

अभिनवगुप्त has stated all these views of his predecessors and pointed out their flaws in his masterly and psychological exposition of the theory of रस contained in his commentaries on भरत's नाट्यशास्त्र and the ध्वन्यालोक. His main contention is that these views do not truly represent the intended meaning of the रससूत्र of भरत. He, therefore, bases his own interpretation only on भरत's actual words and trend of thought at different places in the नाट्यशास्त्र, and finds ample support for explaining the word 'निष्पत्ति' by the word 'अभिव्यक्ति' or 'अभिव्यञ्जन'. He further adds that the relation (संयोग) between the विभावs etc., and the रस is respectively that of व्यञ्जक (suggestor) and व्यङ्ग्य (the suggested). This is how he, with his penetrating insight, represents the true import of भरत and harmonizes it with the theory of ध्वनि or व्यञ्जना. Although he does not, on the whole, differ much from भट्टनायक, yet he criticizes him for rejecting व्यञ्जना and inventing the two functions of भावकत्व and भोग, which are not supported by the words of भरत and which must be included in the process of रसव्यञ्जना according to the import of भरत. He partially acknowledges the भावकत्व or साधारणीकरण of भट्टनायक; yet he shows the correspondence of भावकत्व with व्यञ्जकत्व (suggestiveness) and that of भोग with the व्यङ्ग्य (suggested sense) which is the same as रसप्रतीति or रसास्वाद (relish of रस). He, therefore, says that there is no testimony of भरत for inventing the two words 'भावकत्व' and 'भोग'.

He further points out that the विभावs etc., together with the proper employment of गुणs and अलङ्कारs in poetry, are themselves represented in a generic or idealized form. The भावकत्व or साधारणीकरण of भट्टनायक is, therefore, inherent in all of them,* nay, in all poetry. When the स्थायिभाव, which is also idealized, is united with the idealized विभावs etc., there is the manifestation (निष्पत्ति–अभिव्यक्ति) of रस. The विभावs etc., are expressed by the power of अभिधा, yet they become suggestors (व्यञ्जक) on account of their inherent suggestive power; while emotions, particularly the स्थायिभावs, cannot be expressed by अभिधा, but can only be suggested (व्यङ्ग्य). This is why there is no express mention of the स्थायिभाव in the रससूत्र *of* भरत. *These स्थायिभावs, which are dormant in the form of instincts* (वासना) in all beings, and which themselves are idealized (साधारणीकृत) in poetry, manifest रस in union with the विभावs etc. It is not, therefore, advisable to postulate the separate power of भावकत्व which naturally exists in the poetic language and its sense possessing the power of suggestion. *It must, however, be remembered that though the rhetorical language generally possesses suggestiveness, yet Suggestion is something more than the rhetorical language, which properly comes within*

* भावकत्वमपि समुचितगुणालङ्कारपरिग्रहात्मकम् ... तस्माद् व्यञ्जकत्वाख्येन व्यापारेण गुणालङ्कारौचित्यादिकयेतिकर्तव्यतया काव्यं भावकं रसान् भावयतीति त्र्यंशायामपि भावनायां करणांशे ध्वननमेव निपतति ।

—ध्व. लोचनम्, २।४.

the domain of अभिधा. Lastly, the भोग of भट्टनायक is the same as the realization of the suggested sense (व्यङ्ग्य) or the relish of रस, the source of which is the स्थायिभाव or the predominant passion of poetry that possesses suggestive power. Thus both the भावकत्व and भोग of भट्टनायक come under the process of *Suggestion* and should not be taken to be independent processes.$

It has been said above that the विभावs etc., are represented in poetry in an idealized form. This means that the विभावs, अनुभावs and व्यभिचारिभावs are respectively not the causes, effects and accessories in the worldly (लौकिक) sense, but are the generalized or extraordinary (अलौकिक) causes, effects and accessories imagined for the purposes of poetry. In the real world the stimuli or the worldly causes of awakening the instincts (वासना) are not always accompanied by a pleasurable emotional response. In the idealized or transcendental (अलौकिक) world of poetry, however, the विभावs, अनुभावs and व्यभिचारिभावs being graphically depicted in union with the स्थायिभाव or the main theme invariably manifest रस or delight. According to अभिनवगुप्त स्थायिभावs already exist in the minds of all beings in the form of latent impressions (संस्कार) or dispositions (वासना), which are held to be innate (नैसर्गिक) on account of their transmission

$ मतस्यैतस्य [भट्टनायकमतस्य] पूर्वस्मान्मतात् [अभिनवगुप्तमतात्] भावकत्वव्यापारान्तरस्वीकार एव विशेषः । भोगस्तु व्यक्तिः । भोगकृत्त्वं तु व्यञ्जनादविशिष्टम् । अन्या तु सैव सरणिः । –रसगङ्गाधरः, १.

from the past birth to the present one, and may be called 'instincts' according to modern psychology. These instincts being trained or organized by experience in the present birth become चित्तवृत्तिs which may be termed 'sentiments'.† In human beings and particularly in the appreciators of literature (सहृदय) the sentiments are developed to a high degree of sensitiveness owing to the study of fine arts and the observation of the behaviour of others. In the real world the सहृदयs get sufficient practice in inferring the moods of others from their behaviour on account of the invariable connection between the ordinary causes and effects, or psychologically, between stimulus and response. This observation of the real world and the study of literature train their sentiments and imagination, and help them in appreciating similar situations in poetry and drama, in which the same sentiments (चित्तवृत्ति) depicted in a generalized form receive the name of स्थायिभावs. As then the स्थायिभावs latently exist in all of us, there is no doubt that the रस exists in a potential state in the reader or the spectator on the one hand, and in the poet, his poetry or drama, characters and actors on the other. But the रस in the latter is called लौकिक (ordinary) and *that revealed in the hearts of the former is called*

---

† सर्वेषामनादिवासनाचित्रीकृतचेतसां वासनासंवादात् ।...जात एव हि जन्तुरियतीभिः संविद्भिः परीतो भवति ।...न ह्येतच्चित्तवृत्तिवासनाशून्यः प्राणी भवति । तस्मात्स्थायिरूपचित्तवृत्तिसूत्रस्यूता एवामी व्यभिचारिणः ।

—अभिनवभारती, अ. ६

अलौकिक (*extraordinary*), since it is *manifested in the appreciators alone,* through the union of the idealized विभावs etc., with the idealized स्थायिभाव of the appreciators. Of course, the difference between the लौकिक रस and the अलौकिक रस is not the difference in kind but only in degree; and the अलौकिक रस is the sublimation of the लौकिक रस. As then the रस in the appreciators (सहृदय) is अलौकिक (transcendental) in the sense that it is the sublimated form of ordinary emotions, the process of its realization is described in Sanskrit literary criticism particularly *from the viewpoint of appreciators.* Thus the readers and spectators who are possessed of keen sensitiveness and *imagination* (विमलप्रतिभानशालिहृदयाः) are alone entitled to appreciate literature.

It will, therefore, be instructive to observe how अभिनवगुप्त psychologically expounds in the अभिनवभारती the process of aesthetic experience in the appreciator's mind while the latter reads a poem or witnesses a drama. He takes the examples of two verses from the कुमारसम्भव and one from the शाकुन्तल for elucidating this mental process. Of the two verses from the कुमारसम्भव one beginning with 'हरस्तु किञ्चित्' has formerly been dealt with. We shall now take the famous verse from the शाकुन्तल, viz., 'ग्रीवाभङ्गाभिरामं मुहुरनुपतति स्यन्दने बद्धदृष्टिः' etc., which अभिनवगुप्त has particularly selected for his psychological explanation from the viewpoint of the appreciator. This verse contains a very graphic description of a deer, who, chased by दुष्यन्त, is running at a great

speed through fear. When we begin to read this verse or witness the scene in the drama, we first cognize the meaning of sentences in it. At the *first stage*, therefore, the *cognition of meaning*, which is an intellectual process, takes place, when we follow the sequence of individual words and sentences through the functions of अभिधा and तात्पर्य. But at the *second stage*, after the meaning of the whole verse has been understood, there stands vividly before us a mental image of the scene in which the sequence of individual sentences totally disappears and cognition gives place to the *free play of our imagination*, which is automatically at work owing to the *idealized representation*, in the verse, of the विभावs in union with the स्थायिभाव of fear."

The frightened deer that stands before the eye of our imagination is thus divested of all particularity and appears in an idealized form, on account of the *power of generalization* inherent in words and ideas. At the *third stage* the स्थायिभाव of fear corresponding to the fear of the deer is awakened in our hearts. The actual deer being now idealized is deprived of the limits of time and place, and the individual consciousness, viz., 'I am afraid', 'He is

---

* अधिकारी चात्र विमलप्रतिभानशालिहृदयः । तस्य च 'ग्रीवाभङ्गाभि०' इति 'हरस्तु किञ्चित्' इत्यादिवाक्येभ्यो वाक्यार्थप्रतिपत्तेरनन्तरं मानसी साक्षात्कारात्मिकाऽपहस्तिततत्तद्वाक्योपात्तकालादिविभागा तावत् प्रतीतिरुपजायते । तस्यां च यो मृगपोतकादिर्भाति तस्य विशेषरूपत्वाभावाद्भीत इति त्रासकस्यापारमार्थिकत्वाद्भयमेव परं देशकालाद्यनालिङ्गितम् । —अभिनवभारती, अ. ६.

afraid,' 'The enemy is afraid,' 'The friend is afraid,' or 'A third person is afraid' is completely lost here. Thus at the *third stage* the sentiment of fear being realized in the *absence of any barriers of the external world* and heightened by our imagination is directly experienced by us as the pleasurable भयानक रस. This happens in the case of every appreciator who reads that verse. This *universalization* (साधारण्य) *of sentiments* is, therefore, not limited to place, time or an individual, but transcends all these barriers. This is the identification of our soul with the poetic situation experienced by ourselves through the power of imagination, after the obstacle of the sense of individuality and the physical world is removed. In the case of the audience witnessing the drama this idealized स्थायि-भाव of fear develops into the sentiment of the group or community (समष्टि), as the instincts (वासना) handed down from time immemorial are common to all. At this time the self-illuminant soul, which is of the nature of pure consciousness (चित्-संविद्) and bliss (आनन्द) and which illuminates all their mental states, reveals itself in the form of delightful surprise (चमत्कार) which exhibits tremor and horripilation on the body. जगन्नाथ says that this is the *suggestion* or manifestation of the pure consciousness of the soul, the veil of ignorance (अविद्या) on which has passed away, and that the विभावs in union with the स्थायिभाव presenting themselves as mental images are illuminated by the Eternal Seer (साक्षी), just as objects seen

in a dream and silver appearing on tin owing to optic illusion in wakefulness are illuminated by the Eternal Seer in the प्रातिभासिक (illusory) state, according to the वेदान्त philosophy. § Though this transcendental relish (चर्वणा, आस्वाद) is akin to the relish of ब्रह्मन्, it is not the absolute state of परमात्मन्. This ineffable 'रस' is, therefore, the suggested sense (व्यङ्ग्य), the suggestors (व्यञ्जक) of which are the idealized विभावs etc. Here, it is the स्थायिभाव alone that is fit to be relished, yet the स्थायिभाव itself is not रस. Nor can the विभावs etc., be individually called रस, just as the ingredients of a beverage cannot be called a beverage. As long as the स्थायिभाव comes into contact with the विभावs and others, the union of all manifests itself as a *synthetic inward experience* or the relish of रस, which vanishes when that union is disturbed. As, however, the separateness of the स्थायिभाव and the विभावs is not felt in the realization of रस, the latter (रस) is free from the limitations of the former. It is only for the relish of this रस or a short liberation from the bonds of the physical world that the सहृदयs read and enjoy poetry again and again. It cannot be said that a poem once enjoyed is not enjoyable again and is to be thrown away. It is repeatedly read not because words in

§ व्यक्तिश्च भग्नावरणा चित्।...प्रकाशयति स्वयं च प्रकाशते आत्मचैतन्यं विभावादिसंवलितान् रत्यादीन्। अन्तःकरणधर्माणां साक्षिभास्यत्वाभ्युपगतेः। विभावादीनामपि स्वप्नतुरगादीनामिव रङ्गरजतादीनामिव साक्षिभास्यत्वमविरुद्धम्। —रसगङ्गाधरः, १.

it convey only an expressed sense which once known need not be known again, but because poetic words are capable of yielding a suggested sense which is ever new to the appreciator. This suggested sense is the रसध्वनि, the stages in the realization of which are imperceptible (अलक्ष्यक्रम). †

अभिनवगुप्त, however, broadly marks, as detailed above, *three psychological stages* in the realization of the रस in a poem by the reader. The *first stage* involves the cognition of the formal or intellectual elements of the poem, and serves as a means to the second. The *second stage* consists of the idealization of things in poetry or drama by the power of Imagination in the reader or spectator. The *third stage* can be marked as the climax of the inexpressible affective (emotional) condition of the reader or spectator. When thus the formal or intellectual, imaginative and emotional elements of a poem blended into one predominant sentiment and making a simultaneous appeal awaken the स्थायिभाव of the reader or spectator, the relish of रस is manifested as *a unity* in his heart, leaving no trace of the constituent elements; and this is why the रसध्वनि is called 'असंलक्ष्यक्रमव्यङ्ग्य' or the suggested sense without imperceptible stages.

---

† दृश्यते हि तदेव काव्यं पुनः पुनः पठंश्चर्व्यमाणश्च सहृदयो लोकः। न तु काव्यस्य तत्र 'उपादायापि ये हेयाः' इति न्यायेन कृतप्रतीतिकस्यानुपयोग एवेति शब्दस्यापीह ध्वननव्यापारः। अत एवालक्ष्यक्रमता।

—ध्वन्यालोकलोचनम्, १।१८.

It may be noted here that Dr. I. A. Richards recognizes in his 'Principles of Literary Criticism' (Chapter XVI) the following *six* stages of the aesthetic experience derived from a poem: (I) The visual sensations of the printed words; (II) Tied imagery or images very closely associated with these sensations; (III) Free imagery or images relatively free; (IV) References to, or 'thinkings of', various things; (V) Emotions; (VI) Affective-volitional attitudes. The Stages I and II can be broadly included in the *first stage* referred to by अभिनवगुप्त, stages III and IV in his *second stage*, and stages V and VI in his *third stage*. This comparison will show that the stages marked by अभिनवगुप्त agree in general with those stated by Dr. Richards, though the details given by the latter are not mentioned by the former. Yet it will be found that the details of Dr. Richards are implied in the three stages referred to by अभिनवगुप्त. It is essential, however, to remember here the difference between the संलक्ष्यक्रमव्यङ्ग्यध्वनि and the असंलक्ष्यक्रमव्यङ्ग्यध्वनि. While ascertaining the exact number of stages the following sentences of Dr. Richards should be particularly noted: "The facts upon which speculations as to the relations between thoughts and the things which they are 'of' have been based, have as a rule been taken from introspection. But the facts which introspection yields are notoriously uncertain, and the special position of the observer may well preclude success. Introspection is competent, in some cases, to discover the

relations between events which take place within the mind, but cannot by itself give information as to the relations of these events with the external world (p. 126) ... ... It is difficult to represent diagrammatically what takes place in thought in any satisfactory fashion (p. 131)." † Under such circumstances it is immaterial whether the number of stages is three or six. On the whole, the mental process of aesthetic experience described by अभिनवगुप्त is generally in agreement with the Western Psychology.

It may also be said that the same process goes on in the mind of the poet while composing a poem, since he is possessed of the same mental outfit, though the affective, cognitive, conative and imaginative elements unified in a synthetic whole are at work in him in a higher degree than in the reader. It is worthy of note what Coleridge says in his enlightened exposition of the poet's mind. It is as follows—

"The poet, described in ideal perfection, brings the whole soul of man into activity, with the subordination of its faculties to each other according to their relative worth and dignity. He diffuses a tone and spirit of unity, that blends, and (as it were) *fuses*, each into each, by that synthetic and magical power, to which I would exclusively appropriate the name of Imagination. This power, first put in action by the will and understanding, and retained under their irremissive, though gentle

† Principles of Literary Criticism, Chapter XVI.

found philosopher"? अभिनवगुप्त, after fully supplying the psychological exposition of the inward aesthetic experience of the reader, depends upon philosophy in the last resort, and all later critics up to जगन्नाथ have followed him in this respect. Particularly *जगन्नाथ has clarified अभिनवगुप्त's doctrine by adding* that this aesthetic experience is 'भग्नावरणा चित्' [pure consciousness free from the veil of ignorance] or that it is साक्षिभास्य [illuminated by tha Eternal Seer]. When this is a perfectly scientific explanation and the last word on the actual aesthetic experience, it is nothing less than short-sightedness to reject it. Why, the noted authors of Sanskrit Poetics not only avail themselves of the वेदान्त philosophy, but also of the शास्त्रs like व्याकरण, मीमांसा, न्याय and साङ्ख्य, as we have formerly dealt with in detail.Branches of human knowledge are always correlated; and it is only for the convenience of treatment that we specify them as different sciences. If these facts are taken into account, it appears unjust to blame the Sanskrit critics for giving a philosophical aspect to their exposition of the poetic (aesthetic) experience, when it is quite evident that even the Western poets and critics have done the same. Of course, in addition to the aboveशास्त्रs, the modern psychology ought to be applied to literature and literary criticism as a valuable aid. Its limitations, however, should never be lost sight of, just as the limitations of the above शास्त्रs have never been ignored by the ancient Sanskrit critics.

XVIII. CONCLUSION.

In this general survey of the Hindu Methodology we have found that the methods of teaching handed down by *oral* tradition for several generations and followed by the Shastris up to this time are corroborated by the mutually acknowledged lingustic theories of the Hindu schools of thought and by the actual records of those methods of explanation in the commentary literature in Sanskrit. We have, therefore, traced this Methodology in the oral tradition of the Shastris as well as in the vast range of Sanskrit literature, so as to preserve the best parts of it for future use in study and teaching. Further, while *entering into the details* we have discovered that the chief characteristics of this General Methodology are the distinctness and unity of purpose, the Causal Relation of things, the means of proof (प्रमाण), the enumeration, classification and definition of categories or topics of discussion, and the organization of subordinate and principal elements or parts and the whole of a subject. These features have been found by comparison to be common to the Eastern as well as Western Methodology, which has, therefore, been prominently *analytico-synthetic* (अन्वयव्यतिरेकात्मक). It will, therefore, be frequently noticed that all the preceding sections dealing with the methods of various शास्त्रs (न्याय, व्याकरण, मीमांसा, वेदान्त, साहित्य, etc.) and with the mental process of verbal comprehension (शाब्दबोध) described by them are, as it were, united with the

common bond of this analytico-synthetic aspect or अन्वयव्यतिरेक into an organized whole.

We have then shown that both the Eastern Logic and the Western Logic have largely contributed to the development of the General Methodology, though the comparison of the Eastern and Western psychology has disclosed to us the fact that psychology has played no small part in that development. We have then seen that the Eastern psychology compares favourably with the Western psychology, has conduced to the development of the principles of education according to the Oriental outlook, and has contributed much to the theory of 'literary criticism' and the appreciation of literature by propounding the theory of रस as in भरत's नाट्यशास्त्र. In this context we have also suggested that some of भरत's tenets of dramaturgy can be applied with advantage to the science of teaching.

In the comparison of the Eastern and Western Logic we have discovered that Induction is not the privileged province of the Western Logic alone, but that it corresponds to the व्याप्तिग्रहोपाय (the process of arriving at the invariable concomitance) and is implied in the 'deductive-inductive' syllogism as propounded by the Indian Logic (न्याय). Then after showing that corresponding to the general methodology some common methodical forms of literature have come into existence in Sanskrit, we have turned to the methods of the व्याकरण, मीमांसा and वेदान्त, which exemplify the common characteristics of the general methodology. Those methods have, as we

have demonstrated, been developed according to the nature (Nominal Style) of the Sanskrit language and the divergent theories upheld by each system of thought. Again, we have been able to disclose that even though those methods are ancient, they bear a striking resemblance to the psychological methods of studying and teaching language as recently developed and recognized by all in the West. In India too Logic is particularly found to have helped the methodical development of the linguistic principles of पद, वाक्य and प्रमाण, which are not sectarian or limited to the शास्त्रs that propound them, but have been accepted as *the general principles of the method of interpretation* even by the शास्त्रs like the वेदान्त, साहित्य, etc., which have again derived for their own exposition much assistance from the Eastern psychology. Particularly the वेदान्त and the साहित्य have harmonized the *logical* principles of पद (व्याकरण); वाक्य (मीमांसा) and प्रमाण (न्याय) as well as the *psychological* principles of the Upanishads, the साङ्ख्य-system and the dramaturgy of भरत into a synthetic whole. Both these are, therefore, the शास्त्रs prominently advocating the *Synthetic Method* of study. Since the न्याय, as a general science (सर्वशास्त्रोपकारक) with its deductive-inductive aspect, has influenced all other शास्त्रs, it has been shown to conduce to the development of the *critical or scientific methods* of study. Again, the combination of पद, वाक्य and प्रमाण has itself made for the correlation of studies and testifies to the existence of the *Comparative*

Method in ancient India, though the modern *Historical Method* does not seem to have existed in ancient times.

Almost all the शास्त्रs recognize the four प्रमाणs of the नैयायिकs, viz., प्रत्यक्ष, अनुमान, उपमान and शब्द, of which the शब्दप्रमाण (verbal testimony) is emphasized more than others in the *General Science of Interpretation*, formulated by the mutual help of the theories of पद, वाक्य and प्रमाण. The common linguistic principles included under the wider शब्दप्रमाण have not only been *theoretically* dealt with in detail by the Indian systems of thought, but have been *practically* employed in the *oral* explanations (teaching) and *written* explanations (commentaries) of intellectual and emotional subjects (*i. e.* शास्त्र and काव्य). The practical application of the interpretative methods of पद, वाक्य and प्रमाण is evidenced by the Sanskrit commentaries following the methods of दण्डान्वय and खण्डान्वय, the various characteristics of which have been revealed by us in the light of the modern principles of language-teaching, so that the ancient method of खण्डान्वय in its modified form should find general acceptance in schools and colleges as the reformed method of teaching Sanskrit.

As the खण्डान्वयपद्धति is distinctly analytico-synthetic in character, culminating naturally in the 'telling of the purport' (तात्पर्यकथन), the preliminary linguistic principles that fall under the शब्दप्रमाण and lead us to the 'तात्पर्यवृत्ति' have been

presented in detail, discovering at each step their philosophical, psychological and educational implications in comparison with the Western psychology, principles of language-study and their educational bearings. It is with this particular end in view that the linguistic theories (Sections XI-XVI) of the वैयाकरणs, वेदान्तिन्s, मीमांसकs (अन्विताभिधानवादिन्s and अभिहितान्वयवादिन्s), नैयायिकs and आलङ्कारिकs have been set forth after organizing and bringing out in relief their scattered psychological thoughts about the process of verbal comprehension (शाब्दबोध) and omitting their hair-splitting distinctions unnecessary for the purpose in hand. Various views of the Hindu schools of thought about the 'अभिधा' (Expression) and 'the import of words' have then been detailed and compared with similar ones as explained by the Western psychology, so as to accentuate their importance in language-teaching. In all this treatment sufficient attention has been paid to the difference to be observed while teaching Sanskrit to the students of elementary, intermediate and advanced stages. The principles of अभिधा and verbal comprehension being based on the mental process of *analysis* and *synthesis* lead us ultimately to the principles of तात्पर्यवृत्ति (Purport), which is predominantly concerned with the *synthesis* of the individual meaning of words. Hence the psychological process involved in this synthesis according to the Hindu schools of thought has been expounded after harmonizing the divergent viws. It has also been pointed out that all these linguistic

principles including the तात्पर्यवृत्ति are as much useful in understanding the unified sense of the *prose* material studied at the school stage as in determining the purport of the highly *intellectual subjects* dealt with in शास्त्रs and studied at the higher stage; and they can be employed as much in the *teaching* of language and literature at both the stages as in the *self-study* of the same.

The understanding of the *purport* depends much on the uninterrupted comprehension of the unified sense of words, which convey either an express (वाच्य) or implied (लक्ष्य) meaning. After the treatment of अभिधा and तात्पर्य, therefore, we have dealt with लक्षणा, which arises from the incompatibility of ascertaining the purport (तात्पर्यानुपपत्ति). That all Hindu schools of thought except that of the आलङ्कारिकs recognize only the *two functions* of अभिधा and लक्षणा, is the indication of the fact that the knowledge of both of them is indispensable to the study and teaching of the inner meaning of prose works and शास्त्रs. But as लक्षणा has also been accepted by the आलङ्कारिकs, we come to know that लक्षणा involves even a subtler aspect of 'fancy' and emotion. It naturally leads us to use some figures of speech and partly culminates in व्यञ्जना, which is prominently an emotional process, and which has been recognized only by the आलङ्कारिकs as the *third function*. The knowledge of लक्षणा and of the mental process behind its employment is as much necessary for the *appreciation* of the inner aspects of *poetry* as

for the *understanding* of intellectual subjects and शास्त्रs. These intellectual and emotional aspects of लक्षणा have, therefore, been purposely set forth, since the knowledge of both is very useful in the *study and teaching* of literature and शास्त्रs. Further, the special function of व्यञ्जना (ध्वनि) and the realization of रस have been treated of in detail, with examples, in the light of the Western psychology and Eastern philosophy, after taking into account the fact that their knowledge is indispensable to the *synthetic* study and teaching of poetry. We have shown that though both the functions of तात्पर्य and व्यञ्जना result in the *synthesis* of meaning, they differ widely in their effects on the readers' or students' minds. The effect of the former is *intellectual*, while that of the latter is manifestly *emotional*, since the latter develops into रस. The detailed treatment of ध्वनि and रस is, therefore, calculated to contribute to the successful teaching of poetry as well as to the *synthetic criticism* of Sanskrit literature. We have attempted in this context to describe, as far as possible, the psychological process of the realization of रस or the aesthetic experience by comparing the views of the Eastern and Western critics. It has then been suggested that 'synthetic literary criticism' in Sanskrit would assume a definite form, if the theories of रस and ध्वनि with their originally synthetic character would be supported by psychology as well as philosophy, Eastern and Western.

These aesthetic principles of literary criticism, which are particularly useful at the advanced stage

of studying Sanskrit literature, are also calculated to enlighten the teachers of Sanskrit on the emotional approach to be made by them while teaching the appreciation of poetry. In other words, the teachers of Sanskrit, being equipped with the knowledge of तात्पर्य, लक्षणा, व्यञ्जना and रस, should be keenly alive to the implied (लक्ष्य) and suggested (व्यङ्ग्य) senses of words in sentences or passages, should either *tell* them to students or explain them *through questions* as framed according to the खण्डान्वयपद्धति, and should always aim at the *synthetic* teaching of literature and the enhancement of रस. Much, of course, depends on the general appreciative attitude, keen sensitiveness and liveliness, which are inborn in some teachers, but which can be developed to some extent in others by the deep, continuous and varied reading of Sanskrit literature in the light of Poetics. It is with this practical aim that लक्षणा, व्यञ्जना and रस have been particularly discussed along with their psychological bearings, which have been newly revealed here.

Now the theories of अन्विताभिधान and अभिहितान्वय previous to the above topics will show teachers how Sanskrit should be taught at the initial and advanced stages respectively; those of the relation of 'Thought and Language' and of अभिधा will elucidate how the 'direct bond' between a word and an idea can be established according to the Hindu outlook, and how words should be taught; and those of तात्पर्य will be helpful in the teaching of the *synthetic* meaning of literary passages. One

thing must be borne in mind that the principles of अभिधा and तात्पर्य will facilitate only the *understanding* of literature, while those of लक्षणा partially, and those of व्यञ्जना and रस wholly, will help the *appreciation* of the same. Thus we have not only detailed the methods of teaching Sanskrit at the initial stage, but also those of teaching the शास्त्रs and literature at the higher stage, so as to maintain the continuity of the psychological method of खण्डान्वय at all the stages.

It is worth remembering that the commonly recognized linguistic principles of पद, वाक्य and प्रमाण as formulated by the वैयाकरणs, मीमांसकs and नैयायिकs respectively have been accepted and synthesized by the वेदान्तिन्s for the interpretation of the Upanishadic philosophy, and also by the आलङ्कारिकs for the *practical* purpose of the appreciation of poetry. With the same practical end in view the आलङ्कारिकs have not only availed themselves of the theories of the above schools of thought regarding अभिधा and लक्षणा, but after harmonizing them they have made original contributions to the linguistic science in general and to the Poetics in particular by expounding the theory of रस and ध्वनि in the light of the साङ्ख्य and वेदान्त systems. Again, it is noteworthy that side by side with the exposition of the *theory* of poetry the आलङ्कारिकs have also dealt with the *practice* of poetry by writing works on the *training of poets*, in whose pursuit of composing poetry they desire to offer aid by means of the *practical*

investigate into the *details* of the oral traditions of the Shastris. This is why the lovers of Sanskrit have tried, with good intentions of course, to introduce reforms with favourable results in Sanskrit teaching on the lines laid down by the Western authorities for the reformed teaching of classical languages like Greek and Latin. There is, of course, no harm in adopting foreign methods (e. g. the Conversational or Direct Method) if they are beneficial particularly to *pupils;* but it is certainly better to draw upon the natural resources of our own soil, to amalgamate them with good things in the West for the purpose of achieving better results, than to resort exclusively to the foreign things. Although the public in general is sceptical about the efficacy of those Western methods, we aver, on the basis of the Hindu Methodology detailed so far and of our own experience, that some of those methods, with modifications suited to the nature of the Sanskrit language and our culture, are calculated to prove beneficial. We shall, of course, support *the modern methods of teaching Sanskrit in many* respects by suggesting a similar procedure to be adopted by teachers in their lessons in the class; yet the main unattempted work that we have done so far is that of supplying a sound theoretical basis for that practical procedure from the Oriental point of view. We have, therefore, attempted so far to trace similar methods in the oral traditions of the Shastris as well as in the actual records of them (e. g. खण्डान्वय) in the commentary literature in Sanskrit. Moreover, we have supplied the theoretical

and psychological background of these methods as found in the common linguistic theories of the various Hindu schools of thought.

Our comparison of the Eastern Methodology with the Western one will, doubtless, prove that the former is in no way inferior to the latter, but is more fundamental and subtle from the philosophical and psychological points of view. Again, it will be repeatedly noticed that the Hindu schools of thought too have their own psychological ideas, on the basis of which they propound their linguistic theories and try to explain the process of verbal comprehension. We have, therefore, not solely depended upon a particular Sanskrit work in the task of our comparison, but have assiduously searched for such linguistic psychology in the Sanskrit works of different schools of thought by selecting similar topics in all, by noting similarity or contrast in their treatment, and at last by comparing those topics with the Western thoughts corresponding to them. Much matter, therefore, that is not given in the usual text-books will be found to have been revealed by us from a new point of view. The general manner of treatment of the Eastern principles of language and poetry as adopted here is first to reproduce them with examples in close conformity with the different Hindu schools of thought and then to reveal, along with our own thoughts, their psychological and educational implications in the light of the psychology, principles of language-study and theories of

poetry in the West. It will thus be noticed that though the same old principles of पद, वाक्य and प्रमाण or अभिधा, लक्षणा and व्यञ्जना have been reproduced by us, yet they have been looked at from a new (comparative) and practical point of view. Of course, no small amount of mental effort is required for a thorough grasp of those abstruse Eastern principles and also for their organized reproduction with the view of preserving the rich thoughts of the past for future use and facilitating the understanding of novices. Yet a more distinctive feature than their reproduction would perhaps be their persistent study, concentrated reflection and mental organization with a definite purpose, i. e., with the comparative, psychological and educational outlook, and also their presentation from the same standpoint, so as to obtain fruitful results in Sanskrit teaching. It is for the worthy judges to decide how far we have succeeded in this attempt.

READING AND RECITATION

Sanskrit literature evinces tendencies towards minute analysis of facts and logical organization of thoughts. These characteristics of methodology are distinctly observable in all the branches of knowledge to which Hindus have substantially contributed. The development of the different Shastras was chiefly due to this methodology; for, the word 'Shastra' signifies nothing less than systematization of knowledge. Although the Shastras are logical in their treatment, we need not suppose that the province of psychology altogether escaped the attention of Hindus. Many works in Sanskrit literature bear testimony to scattered thoughts on psychology, which, however, were not unified into a separate science. in the modern sense of the term. The psychology of the group also received due attention in the science of dramaturgy, which had highly developed and specially treated of the practical principles and ways of heightening the interest of the audience. The attitude of apathy towards Sanskrit language and literature is responsible for the general impression that Hindus had little to contribute to methodology and methods of teaching. The study of original Sanskrit works, however, sometimes reveals to us illuminating ideas on methods of teaching. Practical psychology has found enough scope in the treatment of emotions and sentiments in dramaturgy.

The science of phonetics developed in the प्रातिशाख्यs and शिक्षाs to such an extent in Sanskrit that it has been instrumental in preserving the pristine purity of that language up to the present day. If correct pronunciation is not properly attended to in the teaching of Sanskrit, it is not Sanskrit that is taught but a corrupt form of language like प्राकृतs, which owed their rise to corrupt pronunciation. The importance of correct pronunciation and good reading was much stressed by Sanskrit writers on phonetics, and valuable suggestions on expressive reading and recitation were made in detail in the पाणिनीयशिक्षा, the नाट्यशास्त्र of भरत and the काव्यमीमांसा of राजशेखर. They compare favourably with similar suggestions in English books on phonetics, and are as helpful to teachers of languages as to actors on the stage. It must, however, be remembered that though dramatic aptitude is a great asset to a teacher, it is needless for him to aspire after as much proficiency in histrionics as is demanded of actors on the stage. पतञ्जलि in his व्याकरणमहाभाष्य clearly distinguishes between ग्रान्थिकs or reciters who represented the feelings by words alone and शोभनिकs (सौभिकs) who were teachers of actors and managers of the stage. Teachers are here to assume the role of ग्रान्थिकs, not of शोभनिकs, and conduct their reading and recitation in an expressive manner. It is here proposed to put together those stray suggestions in an organized form for the use of teachers.

The पाणिनीयशिक्षा after dealing with the internal and external effort required for producing sounds

locates the letters of all classes in the mouth and shows how they are to be correctly articulated. According to the नाट्यशास्त्र, the matter to be read or recited consists of words which are divided into several parts, as vowels, consonants, Sandhis or euphonic combinations, case-terminations, nouns, verbs, prepositions, indeclinables, compounds, and nominal as well as verbal derivatives. Gestures performed in combination with these words in sentences are called वाचिकाभिनय.

Now, the characteristics of good reading and recitation, according to भरत, are seven musical notes, three places or organs of utterance, four accents, two varieties of intonation, six embellishments and six auxiliaries.

I. Notes–The seven musical notes are षड्ज, ऋषभ, गान्धार, मध्यम, पञ्चम, धैवत and निषाद, which are used as basic sounds to express different sentiments. For instance, मध्यम and पञ्चम are employed as basic notes to express humour and erotic sentiment (हास्य and शृङ्गार), षड्ज and ऋषभ to represent the sentiments of heroism, wrath and surprise (वीर, रौद्र and अद्भुत), गान्धार and निषाद to reveal pathos (करुण), and धैवत to show terror and repulsion (भयानक and बीभत्स).

II. Places–The three places or organs of utterance are the chest or lungs, the throat or glottis and the head or palate in which originate the low (मन्द्र), middle, (मध्य) and high (तार) pitches while modulating the voice. When a person is at a dis-

tance, we speak with him in a high pitch; when he is not far off, we speak in a middle pitch; and when he is very near, we speak in a low pitch. In ordinary speech we make use of the middle pitch; but in reading and recitation, a sentence should generally start in a low pitch from the chest, should rise to a high pitch towards the palate or head and should stop at the middle pitch in the throat. In reading poetry possessed of प्रसाद, the voice should be brought to a low pitch; in reading poetry containing ओजस्, the voice should be raised to a high pitch and the poetry of a general type should be read with lower and higher pitches in succession.

III. Accents–The four accents are उदात्त, अनुदात्त, स्वरित and कम्पित. As their use prevails particularly in the Vedic Sanskrit, their consideration is of little concern to those who are more interested in Classical Sanskrit.

IV. Intonation–राजशेखर, who in his काव्यमीमांसा has dealt with intonation in detail, says that intonation or काकु is a quality of expressive reading and that it serves to bring out the proper sense of a literary passage. The reader should make use of intonation in his reading with due attention to the three styles of composition, viz., the वैदर्भी which is lucid and perspicuous, the गौडी which is full of lengthy compounds, and the पाञ्चाली which is mid-way between the two. There are two main varieties of intonation, viz., साकाङ्क्ष and निराकाङ्क्ष. The intonation which expresses expectancy

on account of the incompleteness of sense in a sentence, is called साकाङ्क्ष. It shows that the sense of a sentence is not complete unless another sentence is assumed to follow it. When another sentence is thus supplied, the intonation required to show that the sense is complete, is called निराकाङ्क्ष. The साकाङ्क्ष काकु (Expectant intonation) can still further be subdivided into three varieties to express an objection, a question and a conjecture; while the निराकाङ्क्ष काकु (Non-expectant intonation) also can be subdivided into three varieties to denote a statement, an answer and a decision. The same sentence can be shown to be complete or incomplete simply by the use of proper intonation. Thus the change of intonation employed in the same sentence implying an objection, a question and a conjecture, can be made to imply a statement, an answer and a decision respectively. This being the case, the two main varieties of intonation with their subdivisions are mutually related. There are other countless varieties of intonation, which are devoid of any mutual relation, but which express several subtle emotions.They denote acceptance, entreaty, ridicule, consent or approval,affirmation,concealment of feelings,sorrow or repentance, roughness, encouragement, ardent desire or eagerness, despondency or disgust, etc.

More than one of the various intonations can be combined in several ways in a sentence or verse to express various emotions. The use of intonation is not only prevalent in ordinary speech, but it reigns supreme even in Shastras, and it is, as it

were, the life of poetry. Intonation allied with flawless pronunciation not only reveals change in meaning, but also unfolds the skill of a trained person in expressive acting. A poet, therefore, should compose poetry and an intelligent reader should read it in such a manner, that the reading would shed a new light on the minds of hearers. An adept in the poetic art might compose poetry in any way he likes; but he, whose speech is accomplished, knows how to read. Just as good voice is the result of repeated practice in the previous birth, so excellence in reading is attained after many births.

V. Embellishments—The six embellishments (पाठ्यालङ्कारs) which lend charm and colour to reading and recitation are the varieties of the three pitches तार, मन्द्र and मध्य, as stated above. Thus, the high pitch (तार) can be subdivided into उच्च and दीप्त, the low pitch (मन्द्र) into मन्द्र and नीच, and the middle one (मध्य) into द्रुत and विलम्बित.

The उच्च sound, which is synonymous with the तार or high pitch, is produced in the head or palate and is used while speaking with a person at a distance or calling him, while expressing astonishment or frightening another person, and in an exchange of hot words. The दीप्त sound also rises from the head or palate, but being higher than उच्च or तार, it is used to act a quarrel, debate, refutation, delirium, violence, expostulation, anger, heroism, haughtiness or harshness of words.

The low sound (मन्द्र) comes out of the chest or lungs and is used to express despair, fatigue,

hesitation or fear, anxiety, pitiable condition, uneasiness, sickness, wounded state, swooning or drunkenness. The नीच sound which also comes out of the chest is lower than the मन्द्र. It represents speech in a normal state of mind or signifies sickness, fatigue, fear, swooning, etc., in an extreme form.

The द्रुत sound, a variety of the middle pitch (मध्य), is produced *rapidly* in the throat or glottis to show stumbling, whirling sensation, lust, fear, shivering, vexation, etc., and to communicate an affair which is not secret. The other variety of the middle pitch is the विलम्बित tone, which is produced *slowly* in the glottis to express amour, conjecture, deliberation, indignation, jealousy, lisping, bashfulness or shame, anxiety, threatening, wonder, fault-finding, and prolonged displeasure.

Several permutations and combinations of these embellishments of pitch and intonation can be made in reading to show blendings of different sentiments. Thus while dramatizing the sentiments of love, humour and pathos, intonation with the विलम्बित pitch should be used; while expressing the sentiments of heroism, wrath and wonder, the pitch of intonation should be दीप्त and उच्च, and while suggesting fear or disgust, the pitch should be द्रुत and नीच. These combinations being too minute to be enumerated, mere theorizing in this matter is of less value than practice. Keen observation of human behaviour and repeated practice in this imitative art can impart skill in the blendings of different sentiments.

VI. Auxiliaries—Lastly, the six auxiliaries of reading (पाठ्याङ्गs) are the break or pause (विच्छेद्-विराम), resonance (अर्पण), emphasis (विसर्ग), phrasing (अनुबन्ध), the upward glide of voice (दीपन) and the downward glide (प्रशमन).

(1) *Pause*—The break or pause is to be made with a definite purpose according to the completion of meaning either in a sentence or after letters varying in number from one to four. These purposeful or psychological pauses, which are the exponents of meaning, should be differentiated from the pauses (यतिs) in prosody. So, not only in the reading of prose but also in the recitation of poetry, attention should be paid more to the psychological than to the metrical pauses.

Effort should be made to show these pauses along with gestures (वाचिकाभिनय), since gestures bring out the sense of a passage in full relief. Gestures in reading and recitation consist of the movement of hands and eyes along with the pauses indicating the sense. While expressing the sentiments of heroism and wrath, the hands should be in the position of striking with a weapon; while showing the sentiments of repulsion, they should be contracted as if in contempt; while representing humour and pathos, they should be stretched according to the respective purpose of those sentiments; and while acting the sentiments of astonishment and fear, they should stand still as if in amazement and terror respectively. Thus the movement of

hands allied with pauses and embellishments aids the definite comprehension of meaning.

We may then say in general that pauses are to be used either after inflected words or after the completion of meaning. In the case of an unusually lengthy compound, however, breaks or pauses are to be made after as many members of that compound as can be uttered in a single breath. Care, of course, must be taken to utter the compound in such a way that its individual members are distinctly shown without breaking their unity as a componud. But in all other cases, the sense alone would decide where one should pause.

The next question arises as to how long the reader should pause according to the sense. Broadly speaking, if despair, intolerance or change of mood is to be shown, and if a question is to be put, the pause should be made for about eight seconds. But in the case of other sentiments, the length of the pause should vary according to the sense from eight to forty-eight seconds. Even if a letter before the pause is long (दीर्घ), the pause should not be unduly lengthened; i. e., the length of that pause should not exceed forty-eight seconds. In the recitation of poetry, the pauses in a particular metre should be decided with due attention to the sentiments therein. The reader should not corrupt words in his reading, nor recite a verse in a wrong metre, nor pause where he ought not to, nor read without emotion and intonation. In good recitation verses are set to proper tunes, with due regard to

the length of the pause, beats of time (ताल), rhythm (लय) and completeness of sense.

(2) *Resonance*–The voice should be so used with ease and charm that the whole place, where reading or recitation is going on, should resound with it. This is, of course, to be accomplished with due consideration to the other characteristics of good reading and to the heightening of the main sentiment (स्थायिभाव) with the help of fleeting emotions (व्यभिचारिभाव).

(3) *Emphasis* (विदर्भ)–Words as well as clauses in a sentence should be read with proper emphasis according to their relative importance, so that monotony in speech or reading might be avoided. Forethought will have to be devoted to the ascertainment of the places needing emphasis.

(4) *Phrasing* (अनुबन्ध)–A word or words are to be grouped with the preceding or following ones to suit the meaning of a passage. This is called 'phrasing' in English; and it depends as much upon the grammatical construction of a sentence as upon breath. For instance, adjectives should be grouped with their substantives and adverbs with their verbs. Generally, in the construction of a Sanskrit sentence the बहुव्रीहि compound, doing the work of an adjective, predominates. If many such adjectives of considerable length follow one another, the grouping of words, as shown above, will not be possible. The reader should, in this case, stop a little and connect the preceding

adjective immediately with the following one in such a way that all such adjectives together might be taken to belong to the same part of speech and then grouped with their substantive.

In 'phrasing' the question of observing *Sandhis* sets in. In the reading of poetry many *Sandhis* are observed for fear that the rules of prosody might be violated. But in the reading of prose as well as in *Speech,* सन्धिs are rarely observed even by the reputed Shastris. This practice of the Shastris is corroborated by a well-known Sanskrit verse † which says that the *Sandhi,* in an inflected word, between a root and its prefix, and in a compound, is compulsory (नित्य); while in a sentence it is optional, i. e , it depends upon the speaker's will. From this rule we may generalize that सन्धिs between the different words of a sentence need not be observed, in order that our reading might be intelligible to the hearers. We may still further say that in the reading of a passage, the quick and ready separation of सन्धिs in the words of a sentence testifies to the better understanding of the reader. नित्यसन्धिs, however, must be observed in reading and speech, since the idea of organic unity or oneness is always implied in an inflected word, a root with its prefix, and a compound. In the observation of नित्यसन्धिs, assimilation of sounds takes place and it further helps the reader to simplify the articulation of letters (vowels and consonants). The separa-

† संहितैकपदे नित्या नित्या धातूपसर्गयोः ।
नित्या समासे वाक्ये तु सा विवक्षामपेक्षते ॥

tion of वृन्विs,-even in the three varieties above specified, is artificial and not much conducive to the comprehension of meaning. It may then be stated in general that वृन्विs are useful more for the purpose of writing than that of reading and speaking.

(5-6) *Inflexion*—Both दीपन and प्रशमन together are called 'Inflexion' in English. दीपन is the upward glide of voice. In दीपन, the reader or speaker should take particular care that his voice glides upwards through the pitches मन्द्र, मध्य and तार, and does not rise abruptly in a discordant manner. On the other hand, in प्रशमन the voice should glide downwards through the तार, मध्य and मन्द्र pitches in succession.

While expressing humour and erotic sentiment, a sentence should be read with the use of resonance, pauses, upward glide and downward glide; while representing pathos, heroism and wonder, it should be read with pauses, downward glide, resonance, upward glide and phrasing; and while showing repulsion and fear, it should be read with pauses and resonance.

Conclusion—In short, sweetness and distinctness of letters, proper separation of words, good voice, composure (gravity) and rhythm or assimilation of sounds are the six qualities of reading.' The reading, which is accompanied by intonation, where pauses are made with due attention to the sense, and where articulation of individual letters is distinct and pleasing to the ear, is graceful. Again, depth of voice, harmony, proper finish of

high and low sounds, and charming utterance of conjunct consonants are the characteristics of good reading. A tigress while carrying her young ones in her jaws does not hurt them with her tusks, yet holds them fast lest they should fall; letters should be articulated in the same manner. In other words, letters should neither be articulated indistinctly nor stressed unduly. One who properly articulates letters is held in great esteem. In good reading case-terminations are distinctly shown, compounds are not deformed and सन्धिs are not unnaturally split. An intelligent reader, therefore, should not unite detached words, separate compounds or mutilate the verbal form. The essence of good reading is, then, the making of pauses suited to the sense and the articulation of letters according to the five varieties of utterance, viz., accent, time-measure, pitch and internal as well as external effort.

On the other hand, reading in a sing-song fashion, unnecessary haste, purposeless nodding of the head, mere repetition of what is written, non-comprehension of meaning and feeble voice are the six faults of reading. Again, the reading, which is too speedy or too slow, loud or inaudible, too harsh or too mild, and in which words are separated wrongly and uttered indistinctly, is faulty. *

---

* पाणिनीयशिक्षा, verses 25 & 31-37; काव्यमीमांसा, Chap. VII; भरतनाट्यशास्त्रम्, अ. १९.

Part III - Practice

THE STUDY AND TEACHING OF SANSKRIT LITERATURE.

Now that a sound theoretical basis of the Hindu Methodology has been supplied here for Sanskrit teaching, the teachers of Sanskrit should not be sceptical about the methods to be adopted by them. The only thing that is required of them is genuine love for Sanskrit (language and literature), constant study of it, and inner urge for the improvement of its teaching. The Sanskrit teachers (in schools and colleges) must, therefore, remember that no half-hearted attempts from the sole point of view of examinations will do here. Their sole aim must be to try heart and soul to popularize the study of Sanskrit irrespective of material gain; and that aim will, it is hoped, be achieved, if the *theory* of Sanskrit teaching as detailed in the former part and the *practical procedure*, that will be demonstrated in this part in the light of that theory, will be known and employed in actual teaching. Hence, for the proper application and general adoption of the खण्डान्वयपद्धति in secondary schools, it would not be out of place to suggest here an improved procedure, which, in combination with the Western methods of language-teaching, could be advanta-

geously followed as supplementary to the method of खण्डान्वय, while giving explanations.

In the study of Sanskrit literature it is advisable to begin with prose rather than with poetry, if the principle of gradation should be attended to. At the initial stage, pupils, who are generally more familiar with the language of prose in the mother-tongue than that of poetry, can grasp and master Sanskrit prose easily, though occasional use of simple सुभाषितs may be recommended for the sake of variety. Now, lessons in Sanskrit prose mostly comprise descriptions, stories, dialogues or passages from dramas and rarely reflective passages, the story-form of literature predominating over others.

The first requisite, therefore, is that of *a good text-book* containing a variety of such interesting prose lessons graded in vocabulary and other linguistic aspects. Good Sanskrit text-books must be written for the elementary and intermediate stages, after taking into account the Hindu culture in which the pupils are brought up and also the recognized principles according to which good text-books are written in the West. The subject-matter of text-books should be connected, varied and interesting, and not monotonous or representing only one type of literature. It should embody descriptions of Nature, dialogues, mythological stories, folklore and fairy tales, stories of animals and a few reflective passages, all of which are to be culled from the vast range of Sanskrit literature. For the initial stages, lessons will have to be newly written in

simple prose, so as to suit the capacities of beginners. *Topics in text-books should be familiar to* students, yet they should not be childish, since students, when they begin to learn Sanskrit, are comparatively advanced in age and understanding. Select mythological stories from the महाभारत and the रामायण; folk-lore, fairy-tales and legends from works like the कथासरित्सागर, भोजप्रबन्ध, वेतालपञ्चविंशति, etc., humorous animal stories from the पञ्चतन्त्र and the हितोपदेश, and descriptions of Nature, in various seasons, from the रामायण may be taken and kept as models for re-writing the same in easy prose. Although a few reflective and moral passages from the works like the मनुस्मृति, चाणक्यनीति, etc., may be taken and transformed into prose, they should not be abstruse or abstract, but should bear upon the life of students. Readers for beginners should contain more prose than poetry, which should be gradually introduced, in accordance with the development of students' understanding. Simple and concrete सुभाषितs and स्तोत्रs containing graphic descriptions of deities may be introduced at the initial stage, after which original poetic passages from the रामायण, महाभारत, रघुवंश, etc., should be included in the text-books for the intermediate and advanced stages, along with original and simple extracts from the दशकुमारचरित, कादम्बरी, etc. No passages from the Vedas, ब्राह्मणs or उपनिषद्s should be taken in the text-books for schools, since the Vedic Sanskrit is an antiquated form of language, while the Classical

Sanskrit is akin to the vocabulary, idiom and structure of the mother-tongue. It is also seen that the commentaries on the Vedic literature have been written in Classical Sanskrit, which is naturally the main door through which the Vedic literature can be approached. If any interesting matter for school pupils is to be culled from the Vedic literature, it should be presented in the garb of Classical Sanskrit. The language, therefore, that must be used in the text-books for schools should be after the models of Classical Sanskrit. For beginners, easy and interesting descriptions and dialogues bearing upon the experience of students will have to be newly written in imitation of good descriptions in Sanskrit literature and of the colloquial style of classical dramas; while in the readers for advanced pupils original, descriptive and dramatic passages from भास, कालिदास, बाण, भवभूति, etc., may be inserted. The lessons to be read at the initial stage should be short, and those at the advanced stage may be a little longer.

The *language of Sanskrit text-books* should proceed from easy specimens to difficult ones and approach Classical Sanskrit in a graded manner. It should be graded in matters of vocabulary, grammatical points, idiom and syntax, and not more than *ten* new words should be introduced in each lesson. Due attention to the high frequency of words in the descriptive and story forms of literature should be paid, and those frequent words may be used in lessons along with pure Sanskrit (तत्सम)

words current in the mother-tongue. Particularly in the first lessons in Sanskrit no सन्धिs should be observed, and there should be a large proportion of तत्सम words. When सन्धिs and समासs are to be introduced in lessons, they should be used gradually. New words in a passage should be judiciously distributed over a number of lessons, and the same words should recur in different contexts. Necessary grammatical facts should also be distributed over various lessons; but they must be made subservient to the literary charm of ideas. Some irregularities in language are indispensable and may find their way in text-books so as not to allow pupils to form an impression that Sanskrit language is composed only of regular forms; yet those irregularities must be much less in number than regularities. The types of sentences to be employed in the text-books for beginners should generally consist of simple and compound sentences, complex ones being used in those for advanced pupils.

Sanskrit text-books should, moreover, be supplied with intelligent questions and exercises on the subject-matter and language of individual lessons. Illustrations, that would be helpful in explaining the text and would aid the imagination of pupils, may, of course, be presented to add to the attractiveness of books. At the end of every reader organized lists of ready-made grammatical forms of nouns and verbs may be appended for frequent reference. In this way, there should be

three or four graduated readers that would make a gradual approach to Classical Sanskrit.

Before beginning the study of textbooks one fact must be taken into consideration that pupils are generally found to possess a vocabulary of more than 800 तत्सम words,* as frequently met with in the mother-tongue, by the time they begin to study Sanskrit in English schools. It is worthy of note here that the vocabulary of Basic English consists of 850 words only. Owing to this advantage, Hindu pupils, after the learning of Sanskrit inflexions and their functions, can grasp at least the general sense of a simple Sanskrit passage, story, or verse, though not its details, even before its explantion or translation is attempted. Again, even if translation from Sanskrit into the mother-tongue be attempted, the translation of तत्सम words is the translation of inflexions rather than that of those words, as many of them are, and can be, retained in the vernacular translation without any change. These are some of the reasons why Sanskrit can be used with advantage as a medium of instruction and why the exclusive use of the Translation Method is superfluous in the teaching of Sanskrit. Thus Sanskrit is not a foreign language like English to Hindu pupils, who have

---

* We have given this approximate number after counting Sanskrit words in Marathi text-books studied by pupils from the primary to the secondary stage. This number has not, however, been corroborated by giving vocabulary tests to pupils.

an aptitude for picking up its general sense; and the more they are advanced in the study of their mother-tongue, the more their general understanding of Sanskrit is developed.

We shall now see how this general understanding of Sanskrit is further developed in the various purposeful steps of *prose lessons.*

The teaching of literature is conducted through three successive types of lessons, viz., (1) General Study, (2) Detailed Study, and (3) Review or Revision. The division of procedure in each lesson into three main stages, viz., (1) Preparation or Introduction, (2) Presentation or Development, and (3) Application or Conclusion, is more practicable and elastic than the rigid process of the five formal steps of Herbart. Let us now turn to the 'Preparation' stage—

I. PREPARATION

(a) *Introduction of words*-At the elementary stage all the concrete and unknown words in a new lesson are introduced by the teacher in direct association with objects, actions, sketches, diagrams or pictures. Personal pronouns, 'action' verbs, concrete nouns, concrete adjectives and concrete indeclinables can be well introduced by using these concrete devices. Such words are to be introduced by the teacher in the context of a familiar topic and not in a disconnected manner. As *the unit of language is a sentence,* these words are to be used in sentences which should all be mutually connected to form a link or association of ideas.

These short sentences develop, as it were, into a series of little descriptions of objects and actions shown. If proper association of ideas with objects, etc., is formed, pupils can easily learn and recollect new words and phrases thus introduced, since suitable context is a good aid to memory. This is really a relieving feature of the new method and it serves to develop a proper mental attitude of pupils towards Sanskrit. On the other hand, pupils taught by the Translation Method have to undergo the tedious process of memorizing lengthy word-lists, which are, of course, unsuccessfully recollected and reproduced by them for want of context. In addition to the association of ideas enough sense-appeal is made to give a concrete aspect to the subject-matter, as follows—

The teacher after using a new word in a sentence and establishing a direct bond between the word and its underlying idea, repeats that word thrice and asks the pupils to hear and repeat the same thrice after him in chorus. Here, the Sanskrit teacher is naturally expected to be *an expert in Sanskrit phonetics*. Particularly from the point of view of Sanskrit phonology, distinct articulation of sounds representing letters, their differentiation, and location of places in the mouth are quite necessary. While a word is thus being drilled *in chorus*, the teacher writes it on the black-board and then checks the correct pronunciation of it by making the pupils repeat it *individually*. In writing new words on the black-board he should follow a pre-arranged plan. He should write—

(a) *Nouns* with their nominative singular forms so as to show their different genders and endings,

(b) *Adjectives* in their original form without any gender to show that they agree with nouns in all genders, and

(c) *Verbs* with their third person singular forms of the present tense to suggest their different conjugations (गण s). Again, words of different parts of speech may be arranged in separate columns. Pupils are to take down in their note-books these new words in the same order in which they are being written by the teacher on the black-board, so that along with hearing and repeating, they can practise the correct writing of those words with their hands. Accuracy must be observed in pronunciation, writing, and semanticizing, proportionate attention being devoted to each of these aspects.† This process involves hearing or reception, repetition or ready reproduction, and unconscious assimilation of language, for which spontaneous capacities of pupils for learning language are utilized. Briskness in this oral drill helps proper assimilation of language, as pupils are given no time for mental translation. In this process three senses, viz, ears, tongue and eyes are appealed to, and the principle of 'Gradation' is followed by making use of (a) ears before eyes, (b) reception before reproduction, (c) oral reproduction before reading, (d) immediate memory before prolonged memory, (e) chorus work before individual work, and (f) drill work before free work.† In chorus work pupils'

---

† Read 'Principles of Language-study' by H. E. Palmer.

instincts of gregariousness, self-assertion and pugnacity are awakened and their imitative tendency is revived. Pupils spontaneously imitate their teacher and actively participate in the lesson by confidently expressing themselves with the spirit of play and emulation. A sort of rhythm is felt in the chorus repetition after the teacher, and pupils instinctively like this rhythmic repetition which also serves as an aid to their memory. This give and take between the teacher and the taught heightens the interest of pupils who begin to feel a sense of achievement in their work. The immediate memory of pupils is tested every now and then by asking them to show actions, objects or pictures and repeat the words signifying them. Repeated appeal to this immediate memory strengthens associations and gives satisfactory results when prolonged memory is appealed to after a number of days. The *use of connected Sanskrit speech* in sentences instead of disconnected words creates proper Sanskrit atmosphere, which helps the pupils to develop a proper mental attitude towards the subject. The *actual use of the language* makes an impression on their minds that Sanskrit can be better learnt by *use* than by tedious and abstruse *rules*. Thus the *oral drill* in Sanskrit goes on until all the new words in the lesson to be read are introduced. One thing should be noted here that while introducing *new* words in a lesson, the teacher should ascertain which Sanskrit words have been met with by pupils in their mother-tongue, so that he might not be required to introduce them as *new* words. Care

will, however, have to be taken to drill some of those words for removing the vernacular influence, for introducing their correct Sanskrit forms and for showing their proper pronunciation. But under no circumstances should the teacher try to elicit new words from the pupils, supposing that they might be known to them. Nobody should here suppose that exclusive use of Sanskrit is to be made throughout the whole lesson. *The use of the Sanskrit medium is to be made for cultivating good language habits which will ultimately serve as a means to good reading.*

Importance of oral drill had been already recognized by the reciters of the Vedas, and the sequence of stages in it had been actually followed by them in their recitation, long before the Vedas were committed to writing. In spite of the existence of their printed texts at present, oral reproduction of the Vedas is still held in great esteem. Thus the oral drill in 'language lessons' is just like the 'आवर्तन' or 'संथा' of Vedic students, who are still found repeating after their preceptor *in chorus* as well as *individually*. The first lesson in the study of the Vedas begins with the recitation of the गायत्रीमन्त्र at the time of the उपनयन ceremony. The गृह्यसूत्रs describe the procedure of this recitation in the following way: "The pupil, after invoking the deities for bestowing Memory (मेधा) and spiritual power (तेजस्) on himself, requests the preceptor to teach him the गायत्री, which also contains an invocation for developing understanding. The preceptor is to recite the

मन्त्र thrice in the following manner : First, in order to enable the pupil to follow him well, the teacher should stop after every quarter of the verse, then after every hemistich and lastly he should recite the whole verse, the pupil every time repeating after him. According to the *capacity* of the pupil, the preceptor should, in the beginning, cause him to recite even four letters each time". This clearly shows that the Vedic teachers did not desire their pupils merely to repeat mechanically but wanted them to be coupled with understanding, since the deities were invoked for the gift of Understanding, Memory and Spiritual power. $

The ऋग्वेदप्रातिशाख्य, which sets down minute phonetic rules relating to the recitation of the ऋग्वेद, gives a detailed procedure for recitation. The important part of it is as follows:-In order to give a clear suggestion to his pupils the teacher should pronounce particular words *twice*. Generally a collection of three ऋक्s (verses) to be studied is called a प्रश्न. If the प्रश्न contains a compound, the teacher should pronounce one word only; and if there is no compound, he should recite two words.

$ मयि मेघां मयि प्रजां मय्यग्निस्तेजो दधातु ... ... इत्युपस्थाय ब्रूयात्–अधीहि भोः सावित्रीं भो अनुब्रूहीति ... सावित्रीमन्वाह पच्छोऽर्धर्चशः सर्वाम् । यथाशक्ति वाचयीत । (आश्व. गृ. सू. १।२१।४–६); (आप. गृ. सू. प. ४, खं. ११, ८–१०);–तस्मा अन्वाह 'तत्सवितु' रिति। पच्छोऽर्धर्चशस्ततस्सर्वाम् (९–१०) ।

अथास्मै सावित्रीमन्वाह पच्छोऽर्धर्चशः सर्वां च तृतीयेन सहावर्तयन् ।

— कात्यायनसूत्रम् २।३।

Then the first pupil on his right side should repeat the first word and others should repeat the same after him *in chorus*. After thus finishing one प्रश्न, all the pupils should repeat the whole of it again and again". Here, the part and whole methods of memorizing seem to have been combined. (ऋक्प्राति. १५।५–६,९, १३–१४) †

Again, *the modern introduction of words in direct association with actions and objects bears much resemblance to the sacrificial procedure followed by priests, who perform successive actions in a sacrifice in association with* मन्त्र*s and sentences describing those actions.* If the Sanskrit teacher adjusts the same procedure to the instincts and capacities ofchildren for teaching them Classical Sanskrit, he will find almost no difference between that procedure and the modern one for introducing words. Moreover, in language-learning the Hindu schools of thought have already taken account of the tendency of *imitation*. They have given due prominence to the *usage of elders* (वृद्धव्यवहार) in the denotative function of words and acknowledged the principle that *language can be better learnt by use* (व्यवहार). No one should, therefore, form an opinion that this procedure is foreign to Sanskrit or that the Direct Method of teaching Sanskrit is a blind imitation of the Westerners.

† गुरुः शिष्यस्य पदमाह मुख्यं समासश्चेदसमासो यदि द्वे ।
एतेन कल्पेन समाप्य प्रश्नं प्रत्याम्नायुस्तत्पुनरेव सर्वे ॥
—ऋग्वेदप्रातिशाख्यम् १५।९

(b) *Other ways of introducing a lesson*—This oral practice of new words in a lesson before its reading is quite in keeping with the principles of language-study. If new words in a lesson are thus independently introduced at the 'preparation' stage, the whole lesson to be studied becomes automatically intelligible to the pupils, and the reading of that lesson can be conducted without repeated interruptions of explanation. It must be here remembered that *only concrete words can thus be introduced at the initial stage.* At the advanced stage, however, this device proves to be inadequate, and ideas contained in abstract words or subtle shades of meanings of peculiar expressions cannot be explained except in the proper *context* of the passage to be studied, since difficulties of classical authors are rooted in their context.

So, at the intermediate and advanced stages familiar experiences of pupils might be awakened and connected with the unknown ones by starting at the 'preparation' stage *an oral discussion bearing upon the topic of the lesson*. If, for instance, the story 'बुद्धिर्यस्य बलं तस्य' is to be studied, the general characteristics (residence, food, appearance, nature, etc.,) of the hare and the lion may be elicited through *questions in Sanskrit or the mother-tongue.* If possible, a few unknown words in the story may be introduced through a suitable picture and be drilled as above indicated. But the more the pupils are advanced, the less there is an occasion for independent word-practice. Sometimes the oral discussion may be based on *a familiar topic*

relating to the theme of the lesson, without in the least revealing the main theme, and merely making it serve as an 'introduction' to the lesson. If the subject-matter be prematurely disclosed in the introduction, the pupils would lose interest in the 'presentation' stage. Such *an introductory talk* may sometimes be continued *in the mother-tongue.* In any case, the teacher should try his best to raise a problem in the introduction and awaken the curiosity of pupils, so that they might be well prepared to receive the new matter at the 'presentation' stage.

II PRESENTATION

(a) *Story-telling*–At the elementary and intermediate stages the general study of a *prose lesson* begins with story-telling or oral reproduction of a passage, in simple Sanskrit. Since the principles of language-study lay down that *hearing must precede reading,* and since language can be more effectively mastered by ear-imitation than by actual reading or rules, pupils must be given opportunities of hearing language before reading. The oral reproduction of a story with the teacher's living voice, gestures, emphasis, etc., is doubtless more enlivening than the reading of the same from the cold print. Moreover, a clear idea of the story *as a whole* being given with much economy of time, the pupils can afterwards begin their reading with the *synthetic view* of the whole and with more understanding. At the advanced stage this story-telling will become unnecessary,

but it may be attempted in the general study, only if a story is unduly lengthy.

What should be the *medium for story-telling* depends upon the individual ability of the teacher. If he feels quite at home in Sanskrit and is possessed of the art of expressive 'telling', he should *use Sanskrit* alone for story-telling. On the other hand, if he feels diffident of using the Sanskrit medium, or if the difficult nature of a particular story or passage demands the *use of the mother-tongue*, he may freely employ the medium of the mother-tongue. The use of the Sanskrit medium for story-telling is, however, not beyond the capacities of average teachers, who will be able to acquit themselves well after a little practice.

A story is generally *told twice* for deepening its impression. If the teacher wants to use the mother-tongue, an improvement can be suggested. The teacher may make a gradual approach to the language of the original by first telling it in the mother-tongue and then in simple Sanskrit, so that Sanskrit atmosphere is preserved in the lesson. In case a story is already known to the pupils, one of them should be encouraged to tell it in the mother-tongue and then the teacher should tell it in Sanskrit. In such cases the subject-matter being known, the form of the language is the unknown, which is to be studied.

The interest of the pupils in the novelty of a story need not slacken, even if it is told more than once. If a story is really good and if its telling is

expressive enough, the pupils are not tired of two hearings at least. On the contrary, if story-telling is merely a cold reproduction of the original, and if the teacher cannot use the Sanskrit medium confidently, story-telling is bound to be a failure; and the pupils, instead of hearing it, are naturally tempted to read it in their text-books. It may be noted here that the pupils are not to be allowed to open their text-books while the story is being told.

It is worthy of note that many Shastris are endowed with this skill in 'expressive telling', particularly story-telling, to such a high degree that they can make their pupils spell-bound by it. Sanskrit teachers must, therefore, do their best to acquire or develop this skill. They must also realize that *the expressive telling of a story is certainly more impressive than even the expressive reading of the same from a book*. For, the teacher, with a keen dramatic sense, being free from the impediment of a book, gets full scope for making his living presence felt more, and enabling the pupils to live in the actual atmosphere of the story. For example, if there are several characters in a story or a dramatic piece, a skilful teacher in his 'telling' can play their role and reproduce their speeches effectively. This skill stands him in good stead even in reading and explanation.

(b) *General questions*–In order to test how far the pupils have followed or understood the story, general questions may be asked *either in the mother-tongue or in Sanskrit*. Those questions may be based on the main stages of the story, so that the

teacher can elicit the general drift of the whole. The number of questions may depend upon the main stages of the story; yet generally it should not exceed *three*. Under no circumstances should teachers waste their time asking pupils to repeat correct answers to general questions.

(c) *Model Reading* $ *by the Teacher*-General questions will be followed by the teacher's model reading, which must be practised by him beforehand, if it should be a model one. After the pupils have received enough *oral practice* in new words and after they have got the opportunity of *hearing* the story, *oral (loud) reading* by the teacher is quite necessary; for, the teacher does all this *oral work* for ultimately approaching the language of the text-book, i. e., as *a preparation for, or a means to intelligent reading*. Pupils should here be asked to open their books and follow the model reading silently in them. The teacher, simply by his *expressive reading*, can now give his pupils indirect instructions in correct pronunciation, phrasing, pause, emphasis, intonation, etc., so as to facilitate understanding. In his reading the teacher should dissolve all संधिs in a passage, as the observation of संधिs is optional in Sanskrit † and as *the splitting of* संधिs *facilitates understanding*. This reading by the teacher is a sort of explanation, and it helps the pupils to make an intelligent approach to the

$ See 'Reading and Recitation'.

† संहितैकपदे नित्या नित्या धातूपसर्गयोः ।
नित्या समासे वाक्ये तु सा विवक्षामपेक्षते ॥

original language of a lesson in the light of their general understanding of the same in oral reproduction.

(d) *Chorus reading*–At the elementary stage the model reading by the teacher is sometimes followed by chorus reading, which the teacher may give at his discretion either before detailed questioning, or after it. If it is given before detailed questioning, it enables the pupils to reproduce orally the language of the story; and thus bringing them in closer touch with the language of the text, it prepares them well for giving intelligent answers in the detailed study. This chorus reading may be dropped at the advanced stage.

(e) *Silent reading*–The model reading by the teacher may be followed by the silent reading of pupils. This silent reading is suitable for the advanced stage only, as pupils at the elementary stage prefer self-expression and self-activity to silence and passivity. To be able to tackle a problem well in its details, it is first necessary to observe hurriedly its main aspects. Hence, the purpose of this silent reading is to cause the pupils, at the beginning of a lesson, *to get the proper perspective or general trend of a passage as a whole* by going through it rapidly; i. e., the pupils are to discover the main points of a lesson, their mutual relations and the proper place of each point in the whole scheme. They are also to note important and difficult portions of the lesson and distinguish between essentials and non-essentials. They

can thus be *made to tackle the general meaning of a passage* by themselves and are trained in self-help. If the general idea of the whole is to be obtained by noting the essentials, briskness is quite necessary in silent reading. It has been experimentally proved that understanding depends much upon speed in silent reading. It is, therefore, very desirable to develop this practice gradually among the pupils, since 'silent reading' is the only variety of reading calculated to be *of much use in later life*. This rapid silent reading of a passage well prepares the pupils to enter upon the detailed study of the same in an intelligent manner.

If 'silent reading' is to go on methodically and yield good results, it should *proceed along the central theme of a passage* or a comprehensive problem, for the solution of which *two or three objectives* may be given. With this end in view the teacher, after *thorough preparation at home,* should find out the main points, determine their interrelations, anticipate the linguistic difficulties of pupils and frame questions for study in the class. The objectives, which are based on the main divisions of a theme or problem, may be presented in the class before the silent reading commences, so that pupils should read the lesson witha definite purpose.

When the silent reading is going on, the teacher should move about in the class and help the pupils to solve their common difficulties by supplying the meanings of a few unknown words

orally or on the black-board. The meanings may be given *either in the form of simpler Sanskrit equivalents or words in the mother-tongue, or both.* Later on, the *use of a small Sanskrit dictionary* may be recommended to pupils for looking up unknown words. *After the silent reading is over,* answers to the objectives may be elicited either immediately or in the detailed questioning. If they are elicited immediately, the teacher should take particular care to connect the objectives properly to the detailed questioning in such a way that the detailed study might be a natural development of the objectives indicating the main problem. Better still to reserve the answers to the objectives for the 'recapitulation stage' which unifies all the salient features in the form of a summary and maintains the organic unity of the whole lesson.

(f) *Detailed questioning and explanation*— The detailed study of a passage commences after all this preparation in the 'general study', which facilitates general understanding and gives the synthetic idea of the passage as a whole. If the lesson is unduly lengthy, it may be divided into *convenient units for detailed study.* What then remains for the teacher to do is to draw the attention of his pupils, in the light of general understanding, to important words, phrases or expressions which are elicited, through questions, by him in the form of answers from the pupils and then explained fully in Sanskrit. This explanation is to be supplied not hurriedly but distinctly and slowly,

so that pupils should be able to follow it easily. *Explanation in Sanskrit* is not an innovation imported from the West; for, almost *all the commentaries on Sanskrit works are in Sanskrit* and not in the mother-tongue. Those who advocate exclusive use of the mother-tongue for explanation, should sufficiently account for the absence of commentaries in the mother-tongue from ancient times up to the present day. Thus explanation in simple Sanskrit is quite in consonance with the traditional method of teaching language.

It must be remembered here that *questions* in 'language lessons' are to be employed not only *for testing the understanding of pupils,* but also *for eliciting difficult and important portions* in the text with a view to supplying their clear explanation. Of course, the teacher should *allow his pupils to keep their text-books open* for enabling them to find out and note important points and supply them in the form of answers to questions. This process of questioning involves the anticipation of the difficulties of pupils and *eliciting them for the purpose of giving explanation.* In following this procedure we can quote no better authority than that of the Sanskrit commentaries written according to the खण्डान्वयपद्धति, in which detailed explanations are supplied after eliciting the words of the text through typical questions. Furthermore, as already stated, the खण्डान्वयपद्धति is mainly based on the psychological principle of expectancy or curiosity(आकाङ्क्षा)which is to be awakened(उत्थाप्य)by

are thoroughly known to pupils serve a very useful purpose in the successful development of a 'literature' lesson and can be widely used for the teaching of literature and even शास्त्रs. A teacher, if he is a good judge of the capacities of his students, can anticipate their difficulties and can enunciate them *as problems in the class in the form of statements* and 'teaching questions' with a view to eliciting from the students the words of the text and supplying their explanation. For learning the idioms and different constructions in any unknown language and even in the detailed study of the mother-tongue the teacher is bound to utilize 'teaching questions' more than 'testing questions'. The form of 'teaching questions' and 'testing questions' is, however, the same, although the purpose in asking them varies as the matter taught is a new lesson or a 'review' lesson.

As indicated above, every sentence involves a thought process indicating doubt, discrimination, causal relation, sequence, etc. Thus every thought process represents a problem, the solution of which depends upon its *analysis into minor parts. This analysis or simplification of the problem is facilitated by 'teaching questions'*. The thought process indicating a causal relation or sequence of facts generally involves an inference (अनुमान), which can be expressed in a five-membered (पंचावयव) syllogism; and questions of a logical type are to be asked for clarifying the nature of that inference. It is thus ascertained whether the inference is

made of an effect from its cause (पूर्ववत् अनुमान), or of a cause from its effect (शेषवत्), or of common experience (सामान्यतो दृष्ट). The problem approaches solution, when the inference involved in it is stated in the form of a syllogism with its five distinct members, the third member or the concrete example (उदाहरण) helping most the clarification of an abstract thought. Such 'thought questions' for eliciting the separate members of a syllogism can, of course, be used at the advanced stage in the teaching of शास्त्रs, where thought is predominant. Shastris are still found making the statement of a five-membered syllogism instead of questioning on it, when a knotty problem or an important proposition of any शास्त्र is to be well impressed on the minds of their students. It must be remembered here that *questions bringing out the synthesis, or the summing-up of thoughts are as much necessary as those used for the analysis of the same* into their component parts; and they may be asked every now and then for ascertaining how far pupils have grasped the idea of the *whole* or the former portions of the text. Instead of asking questions on the synthesis of ideas, the teacher may sometimes *express the synthesis or Purport* (तात्पर्य) *of ideas in the form of his own statement.*

In the teaching of literature, however, 'thought questions' occur in a very small degree, and 'psychological questions' enhancing the 'emotional content' of a passage and appealing to the emotions and imagination of pupils are generally to be em-

ployed. Particularly, at the elementary stage, where a new language is to be learnt, there is less scope for 'thought questions' than for 'drill questions', which doubtless make for the assimilation of that language. For, in language-learning the subject-matter or thought generally is, and ought to be, simpler than that in other branches of knowledge, the linguistic expression being the unknown and more important aspect of study. This, however, does not mean that there is no scope in language-study for 'thought questions', which may occasionally be asked in the *mother-tongue* for removing vagueness in the understanding of a theme and for eliciting the causal connection of successive incidents in a lesson. In language lessons 'drill questions' are more predominant, [of course, at the initial stage than at the advanced stage, and answers to them are given and repeated by several pupils in *the wording of the text*, so as to improve articulation and pronunciation, and to assimilate the language of the text. This assimilation of language in the preceding stages gradually enlarges the understanding of pupils and enables them to take up more difficult language for study in the succeeding stages.

As language is inseparably connected with ideas or thought, the *linguistic peculiarities* to be taught in 'a language lesson' cannot be dissociated from ideas contained in them. Hence, questions in 'language lessons' will have to be framed in such a way that linguistic expressions and their corresponding ideas might be grasped side by side with each other. *The formal study of a languge divorc-*

ed from ideas in it tends to be tedious. On the other hand, linguistic expressions taught in association with ideas in literature arouse interest. The general policy in the teaching of language and literature should, therefore, be to connect language-material with thoughts or ideas, though in the study of a language at the elementary and intermediate stages, linguistic expression will predominate over ideas; and in the teaching of literature at the advanced stage ideas will be more attended to than their linguistic expression. At the advanced stage also *particular idioms, phrases* or *constructions will have to be explained; yet they cannot be properly explained, exemplified, and fixed in the mind,* unless *they* are *elicited through questions in their original wording.* It is not here necessary that each and every word of the textual expressions included in the answers of pupils should have been fully understood by them. For, in the general study of a passage, pupils are previously given the idea of the whole; and hence, the meaning of the textual expressions being broadly known by them, they are in a position to answer the questions of the teacher in the detailed study by intelligently including those expressions in their answers. This process should not, therefore, be considered mechanical or unintelligent, since *detailed explanation of the words just elicited is immediately to be given by the teacher.* Moreover, in answering such questions, pupils have actively to think over the form of the question, the matter to be included in the answer

and the wording of that answer. Again, the general sense of the passage as a whole having been already grasped, and even the meanings of some unknown words being guessed by the pupils in the light of the general context, there is no reason why the answers given by them should be supposed to be unintelligent or 'mechanical'. One thing must be noted here that *the highly inflexional nature of Sanskrit facilitates quick grasp of questions containing interrogative words with particular inflexions.* Those interrogative words naturally give a clue to the words with similar inflexions in the text, which can be readily reproduced by pupils in the form of answers. If the questions and answers thus going on appear hackneyed, stereotyped, or mechanical to some, then along the same line of reasoning, the inflexional character of Sanskrit itself is to blame; and further, all the Sanskrit commentaries written according to the खण्डान्वयपद्धति, which best suits this character of Sanskrit, will have to be called mechanical! Those who will take into account this nature of Sanskrit and the distinguishing features of the खण्डान्वयपद्धति, will be less prone to call these questions and answers 'mechanical.'

We, however, admit that questions and answers may sometimes tend to be mechanical, as pupils are generally inclined to include in their answers unessential words in the text, or reproduce, without understanding, the whole sentence instead of the required expressions. The teacher

should, therefore, take every possible care to check this tendency by putting *pointed questions* and accepting nothing but *pointed answers*; in other words, *he must never allow his pupils to repeat unessential words or expressions.* Experienced teachers know well enough where pupils are expected to give mechanical answers, and they can check this mechanical repetition either in the manner shown above, or by asking pupils to *translate Sanskrit expressions or sentences* thus repeated. But in all cases, translation as a test of understanding is *to follow detailed explanation in Sanskrit.*

When the teacher, as previously dealt with, tries to facilitate the understanding of pupils through the different stages of the lessons for 'general study' and 'detailed study', will it not be sheer misrepresentation of facts to say that questions and answers in Sanskrit lessons are merely mechanical? *Typical question-forms with interrogative words like 'who' (कः or का), 'which' (किम्), 'how' (कथम्), 'when' (कदा), 'where' (कुत्र), 'why' (किमर्थम्), etc., have always to be settled and utilized in the methods of teaching any language,* for the proper organization of the material to be taught. If the material thus organized in the form of questions and answers be called 'mechanical' then all the new methods and formal steps of teaching will have to be called 'mechanical', and consequently 'Translation' would be the only intelligent and natural method of teaching languages!

Thus, if the pupils can grasp the general sense of a passage on account of the reasons stated above, they cannot be presumed to answer *all* questions mechanically. It should, however, be acknowledged that this understanding is not perfect; and hence the need for filling in the gaps in the understanding of pupils in the detailed study by supplying *detailed explanation through questions.*

One reason why questioning in Sanskrit appears to be rigid or stereotyped is that average teachers cannot use the Sanskrit medium with facility, for want of practice or constant touch with Sanskrit literature. For being able to use the Sanskrit medium with ease, it is necessary for teachers to have at their fingers' ends the case-forms (विभक्ति) of nouns which are imperfectly known even by themselves. Such teachers try to conceal their own ignorance by finding fault with the method, and after being trained are more inclined to follow the Translation Method than the Question-and-Answer Method, even if they are allowed to use the mother-tongue occasionally. Much hue and cry has been raised by such teachers against the Question-and-Answer Method, and the *Sanskrit Medium* has been a much vexed problem. These teachers say that real understanding is possible through the medium of the mother-tongue or English, and that the mother-tongue may freely be used for asking questions, though they cannot show how questions are to be framed in the mother-tongue on a Sanskrit passage. There is much plausibility in saying that the mother-

tongue undoubtedly helps real understanding; but it appears strange when it is also said that the English medium helps real understanding! If the unnatural English medium for teaching and understanding Sanskrit appears to be natural to some, it is simply the force of habit and constant touch. If it is admitted that *Sanskrit is more akin to the mother-tongue than the foreign English medium,* is it not advisable to develop practice in the Sanskrit medium rather than in the English one for Sanskrit teaching? If the English medium appears to be natural by the force of habit, *why should the Sanskrit medium not appear natural after constant practice and habit?* Sanskrit explanations are well followed by pupils, if they are gradually accustomed to them. If it is really *beneficial to use the Sanskrit medium for enriching the vocabulary of pupils,* Sanskrit teachers may be well advised to study original Sanskrit works more assiduously for cultivating facility of Sanskrit expression.

It is then obligatory on every *teacher of Sanskrit* to be in close contact with Sanskrit literature and imbibe the Classical Spirit in the sole interest of his pupils. No amount of the technique of teaching mastered in Training Colleges would be of any avail, unless Sanskrit teachers drink deep at the original fountain, develop their individuality by imbibing that Classical Spirit in themselves and are well equipped with the knowledge of Sanskrit to arouse intrinsic interest and *supply Sanskrit explanation in the manner of Sanskrit commentaries.* Much of the hue and cry raised against the Sanskrit

medium would be silenced if it would be perfectly realized that *commentaries on Sanskrit works are in Sanskrit,* even if Sanskrit has ceased to be a spoken language. Sanskrit speech is more apt and easy than any other medium for teaching Sanskrit literature; and it can be mastered after some practice. The crux of the whole situation is that teachers are reluctant to study Sanskrit literature afresh, with particular attention to the beauty of expression, and to put in more effort in their lessons. Why should Sanskrit teachers not condescend to understand the importance of being more and more efficient and of not remaining simply average teachers? For a teacher to continue to be always an average teacher is really a low aim. The needs of average teachers should, of course, be taken into account, but to adapt the method of teaching to the needs of average teachers is certainly to lower our aim of Sanskrit teaching. If then Sanskrit questioning appears to be stereotyped or mechanical to some, it is not the fault of the method but of individual teachers, who do their work half-heartedly, and fail to acquire sufficient knowledge of Sanskrit, which every Sanskrit teacher is expected to possess. In short, specialists are required for teaching Sanskrit, just as specialists are required for other subjects.

The Sanskrit teacher must, therefore, possess, in the first place, sound knowledge of Sanskrit language and literature. Secondly, he must know the mother-tongue of his students, so as to be able

to seek with advantage parallelism between Sanskrit and the mother-tongue in his teaching, and to use it at times for explaining abstruse ideas. Thirdly, he must know the stock of Sanskrit vocabulary possessed by his pupils and their capacity for understanding the new 'language material'. Fourthly, he must be thoroughly acquainted with the technique of teaching which he should use as a means to the achievement of interest. Being equipped with all these qualifications he must plan in advance the lesson to be taught. In this planning he will have (i) to decide the successive steps of his lesson, (ii) to determine what material is to be supplied by 'telling' and what by questioning, (iii) to distinguish between 'teaching' questions and 'testing' questions, essential and unessential points of the lesson, and logical and psychological aspects of the 'language material', (iv) to settle what linguistic expressions should be more stressed than others for assimilation, (v) to observe the principle of 'proportion' in drill-work and free-work, and in questioning and telling, (vi) to decide what words or expressions are to be taught by the use of direct association, translation, definition or context, (vii) to devise good application exercises and assignments for the self-study of students, and (viii) to attend to other important aspects of the lesson. In all cases he will have to adapt his teaching to the needs and capacities of his pupils and bear in mind that the quality of teaching matters more than the quantity of matter taught. After being thus fully

prepared, the Sanskrit teacher will be able to conduct his lesson well in the class.

Now, in the detailed study of the lesson all the aspects as mentioned above are taken for class discussion, which is mainly based on the text-book. The method of using the text-book for class discussion is as follows—

" The testing purpose is entirely absent and the pupils should understand it so. If the discussion is on the text-book, *books may, and probably will, be open*... The activity is intended as directed, co-operative study—not as testing. The teacher takes a prominent part, pointing out main divisions and important points, asking questions, giving incidentally considerable supplementary information, or re-stating and clarifying the statement of the text-book. The pupils follow in their texts by reading silently sentences or passages as directed from time to time, answering questions to show their understanding, and raising questions when they do not understand...This class-period explanation-and-study method may also be intentionally adapted to the pupils' consciously acquiring important elements in study technique. ...This type of discussion period may be used in connection with various other general methods, or it may be thought of as a general method of instruction to be followed from day to day as a distinctive type. The class-discussion, directed by the teacher, is a common phase of the inductive-development method, and... the question-and-answer device may be used in each of the five formal steps of the

induction...Perhaps the most constant and most important phase of the discussion period is the use of questions and answers. Their use for teaching instead of testing will considerably modify the questioning technique."

—Progressive Methods of Teaching,
by Martin J. Stormzand.

We shall now see how in the class questions should be asked and explanations should be supplied according to the different stages of pupils' development. At the elementary stage, it is advisable to deviate as little from the wording of the text as possible. As the third person of nouns, pronouns and verbs predominates in descriptions and stories, it is easy to frame suitable questions on them. But as sentences in dialogues or dramatic passages mostly contain pronouns and verbs in the first two persons, there is less scope for suitable questions in them than in the passages of other types. This difficulty can be got over either by using in questions the third person for the remaining two persons or by asking the pupils to quote the actual words of a particular character in the dialogue. At the initial stage, questions may be asked almost on every word of a sentence for the purpose of fixing in the minds of pupils the function of cases (विभक्तिs) and interrelations of words in that sentence. *Briskness in questioning and repetition of correct answers by pupils train them in the immediate comprehension and unconscious assimilation of language.* If text-books are pro-

perly graded, they help this assimilation without giving the least chance for 'translation'. A small passage may suggest a large number of questions; but the teacher must have enough sense of proportion and judgment as to which words or expressions should be elicited through questions. For instance, questions on the words already known by pupils may be dropped, and those on important or unknown words or expressions may be asked, so as to supply immediately their explanation. In this way it would be wise to lessen the number of questions gradually in proportion to the development of pupils' understanding. At the advanced stage, it would be more intelligent to ask questions bringing out the causal connection of different incidents in a story or the various stages of the development of a theme than base them merely on the wording of the book. It is most desirable for the teacher to frame his questions from the viewpoint of his pupils rather than that of his own, and also to rouse, in his explanation, their interest by quoting concrete examples designed to make a striking appeal to their familiar experience. Here, questions may and can be framed in the mother-tongue for eliciting the experience of pupils and for relating it to the life-situations described in lessons. Such questions add to the interest of the class and make the lesson more graphic. Sometimes imaginary and probable life-situations may be placed before the class as examples and pupils may be asked how they would meet those situations.

Teachers under training believing that 'telling' is a sin, are inclined to ask too many questions without supplying explanations. Again, teachers, who feel diffident of expressing themselves with ease in Sanskrit, ask mere questions or supply meagre explanation in the form of disconnected equivalents. This is how they make their own lesson mechanical! It must be remembered that too much of analysis through questions disturbs the unity of the theme and thus spoils the charm of the whole lesson. The central idea of the lesson, on which depends the organic unity of a theme, should never be lost sight of, and questioning must be made subservient to it, so as to maintain synthesis through analysis. *This synthesis is maintained as much by 'telling' as by moderate questioning.* Judicious 'telling' is, therefore, never to be under-rated, since *inspired 'telling' requires much skill,* which is inborn in some, but which can also be developed by practice. As has been shown previously, introduction of words in direct association with objects, story-telling, descriptions of situations, easy equivalents supplied to unknown words and connected explanations of sentences or paragraphs are the various forms of 'telling' usually resorted to by the teacher. as the matter in all these cases is new to the pupils. All new information should, therefore, be supplied by 'telling'. The time unnecessarily wasted in the detailed process of questioning can be saved by instantly telling the meanings of words or by presenting an idea in a few sentences. The pupils should then be asked to think over what is

told and sometimes they may be encouraged to give connected accounts of their experiences and observations. They may be given scope also for asking their own questions in the manner of the ancient Hindu students, who put comprehensive questions (परिप्रश्नs) to their teachers when they were in doubt about a knotty point. After the students have thus asked their own questions, the teacher is to supply the required information by telling. This 'telling', when it becomes continuous in the absence of questions by the teacher, is transformed into 'lecturing', which is suitable for the advanced stage. At the initial stage, however, too much of 'telling' or 'lecturing' bores young pupils, and hence the need in their case, for alternating 'telling' with questioning. As the pupils advance in understanding, 'telling' may be more resorted to than questioning by making repeated statements and giving detailed explanations. Particularly in the teaching of literature at the advanced stage inspirational 'telling', becomes more effective than questioning. In 'telling' or giving explanations simple language suiting the capacity of pupils must be employed, and the statements of important things must be distinct, slow, clear and impressive, so that pupils would get more time for careful listening and assimilation. Here, proper use of intonation, stress, pause and emotion accompanied by a few gestures conduces to bring in suitable atmosphere and interest.

Imagination of pupils can be stimulated by supplying graphic descriptions of concrete things

and by placing before their mental vision imagery or word-pictures which enable them to visualise the whole situation. Such word-pictures can be presented as concrete illustrations to abstract ideas in a passage by appealing to the experiences of pupils.

There are two kinds of 'illustrations', viz., 'material' illustrations and 'verbal' illustrations. *Material illustrations* are models of objects, pictures, diagrams etc., which should be used particularly at the initial stage, as they contain the element of 'perception' rather than that of the 'imagination'. Use of the black-board may preferably be made to draw sketches and diagrams, which can be used also at the advanced stage for clarifying inter-relations of ideas. *Verbal illustrations* appeal mainly to the imagination and can be supplied in the form of parables, legends, myths, descriptions, word-pictures, familiar expressions, allusions, etc. They are useful at the initial as well as advanced stages of pupils. The mental process involved in quoting concrete illustrations is that of comparison of things that have the element of similarity. Many times verbal illustrations with the element of similarity or identity are expressed in a literary passage itself in the form of figures of speech as उपमा (simile), उत्प्रेक्षा (poetical fancy), रूपक (metaphor) etc. These figures can be explained by a distinct mention of उपमेय (object of comparison), उपमान (standard of comparison), and सामान्य धर्म (common quality), and by showing

parallelism between उपमेय and उपमान with the help of diagrams drawn on the black-board. This method of explanation undoubtedly leads pupils to the clear understanding of ideas in a passage. For intensifying impressions of ideas 'contrast' of things having the element of 'difference' may sometimes be shown. The ideas of contrast are, at times, expressed in a literary passage itself, for bringing vividness in descriptions. The distinguishing marks of recognizing *comparison* and contrast are 'इव' and 'क्व–क्व' respectively in Sanskrit, and students should be made to know the definite use of those words. Of course, all these literary devices and their explanations are suitable for the advanced stage rather than for the elementary one. Mythological or scriptural allusions can also be told as illustrations for introducing 'human interest' in the lesson and for showing their cultural aspect. These allusions might appear to be digressions; but they are very useful for broadening the cultural outlook of students. Care should, however, be taken to make those digressions proportionate to the central idea of the lesson and to suit them to the understanding of pupils. Quotations from Sanskrit literature containing parallel ideas may be cited, if they can be easily understood by pupils without explanation.

Over-analysis of ideas or excess of explanation should be avoided, and what is quite essential and subservient to the understanding and appreciation of the whole should be presented, so as to maintain the unity of the topic and help the assimilation of

ideas and language.* It must be remembered here that *understanding and appreciation go hand in hand and are not to be dealt with as separate aspects.* Explanations should, therefore, be such as would induce pupils to enjoy and imitate the best models placed before them. Appreciation coupled with understanding means the enjoyment and admiration of the aesthetic elements of a passage. Excellence of thought (अर्थ) and perfection of form (शब्द) are the two things to be taken into account in appreciation. The comprehensive term 'thought' includes in itself the implied sense of words (लक्ष्यार्थ), sentiments (रस), ideas with their suggestion (ध्वनि), descriptions of Nature, characterization, etc., while the term 'form' comprises linguistic aspects, such as, style (रीति), felicity of words and phrases, rhythm, metre, etc. When the unification of all these elements into a harmonious whole dawns upon the mind, pupils are led intensely to feel literary delight or aesthetic pleasure, which is predominantly emotional rather than intellectual. This delight is experienced by pupils, when the teacher, with intrinsic interest in literature, keenly feels the beauty of a passage and exhibits his excited emotions in his effective speech. The real appreciation of a passage is possible, if the teacher enters into the spirit of his lesson or is deeply absorbed in the sentiments expressed. This mental attitude of the teacher, particularly in

---

* Read : इहान्वयमुखेनैव [दण्डान्वयमुखेनैव] सर्वं व्याख्यायते मया ।
नामूलं लिख्यते किञ्चिन्नानपेक्षितमुच्यते ॥ —मल्लिनाथः ।

may repeatedly be had at the end of each paragraph and of the lesson, for the purpose of establishing organic unity of the whole. Sometimes it is preferable to give the idea or purport (तात्पर्य)of a paragraph at the beginning of its discussion; for, when the idea of the whole is comprehended, it is possible for the pupils to gather the meanings of difficult words in their proper context and association. Association and context are of great help in explaining the meanings of individual words. Of course, the meanings of difficult words and phrases must be told by the teacher in the proper context. Explanation of words, phrases, clauses, etc., should generally be supplied in the form of complete sentences rather than disconnected or isolated equivalents. If equivalents alone are required, they should be familiar to pupils and be simpler than unknown words in the original; and if no simpler Sanskrit equivalents are available, the teacher should not hesitate to give equivalents in the mother-tongue. In order to test whether the meanings of difficult words have been understood by pupils, the teacher should ask them to use the same words in sentences of their own.

Sentences in paragraphs are simple, compound, complex or mixed. Clauses in complex sentences are, of course, more closely related than those in compound ones. Hence the co-ordination of compound sentences and close relations of subordinate clauses with the principal one should be clearly stated. Transformation of a complex sentence into several simple sentences is an effective explanatory

device. In the case of a complex sentence in the text, the principal clause in it should first be elicited through questions and explained, subordinate clauses being afterwards taken for discussion in their due order. Sometimes the same idea may be expressed in a variety of forms with the view of developing the vocabulary and expressive power of pupils, who should have many occasions to hear language in its various forms. Simple Sanskrit paraphrase may here be given to show how the same idea can be expressed in various ways. For instance—

(a) Two ideas compressed into one sentence by the use of ' इव ' may be expressed in two separate sentences by using यथा and तथा.

(b) Passive constructions should be changed into active ones and *vice versa*. For this purpose, sentences in the passive construction should be elicited by asking questions in the passive construction, and those in the active should be elicited through questions in the active.

(c) A sentence containing absolutives (क्त्वान्तs and ल्यबन्तs) may be split into several sentences by using finite verbs for absolutives, आदौ–प्रथमम्–पूर्वम् in the preceding sentence, अनन्तरम्–पश्चात् in the succeeding sentence, and the indeclinable ' च ' at the end (if necessary); e. g. अहं मुखं प्रक्षाल्य दुग्धं पिबामि=(आदौ) अहं मुखं प्रक्षालयामि, (अनन्तरम्) दुग्धं पिबामि । or... प्रक्षालयामि ... पिबामि च ।

(d) Nouns in the dative case can be substituted for infinitives (तुमुन्नन्तs); e. g. गन्तुम्=गमनाय.

(e) Genitive and Locative Absolutes (अनादरे षष्ठी and सति सप्तमी) can be replaced by the use of यदा–तदा or यद्यपि–तथापि according to the suitable context.

(f) Attention of pupils should be drawn to the independent use of यथा, यत्, चेत् and to that of यत्–तत्, यथा-तथा, यावत्–तावत्, यदि–तर्हि etc., as correlatives of each other in sentences. Their respective meanings with examples should be supplied according to their contexts.

(g) Gerunds in 'अम्' or णमुल्s can be paraphrased as follows—

(i) स्मारं स्मारं (वारंवारं स्मृत्वा) नमति: (ii) स्वादुकारं (स्वादु कृत्वा) भुङ्क्ते; (iii) नामग्राहम् (नाम गृहीत्वा) आह्वयति; (iv) उदरपूरं (यावदुदरं पूर्यते तावत्) भुङ्क्ते; (v) पादघातं (पादेन or पादस्य घातेन) हन्ति, उदपेषं (उदकेन) पिनष्टि; (vi) हस्तग्राहम्=हस्तेन गृहीत्वा etc., etc.

The ways indicated above are not exhaustive but merely suggestive. In addition to these, certain types of sentences, constructions, idioms or phrases must be learnt intensively. Particularly, the idiomatic use of कारकs and particles must be explained and illustrated in the context of the text by supplying several examples of similar constructions in different contexts; and then the pupils should be led to arrive at generalization. It should be borne in mind that such syntactical peculiarities are to be

elicited and explained only in 'prose' lessons and not in 'poetry' lessons, wherein pupils have to be led to visualize situations through questions and answers making sense-appeal. The examples quoted in 'prose' lessons may be introduced by saying यथा at the beginning of all of them; and then they may be connected with the construction in the text by saying तथा. Mere repetition of such examples helps pupils to frame the rule by themselves. As oral work must precede written work according to the accepted principles of language-study, all syntactical peculiarities will first be introduced purely through oral work, and only important things may afterwards be written on the black-board. If examples of a similar construction have to be cited, they should be newly composed by the teacher in simple language and on the basis of familiar experiences of pupils, since examples selected from the classical literature are beyond their comprehension.

Compounds in Sanskrit are a stumbling block in the understanding of students. After they have been inductively taught in independent lessons, students may be made to dissolve them orally in literature lessons. The teacher should, of course, help his students when unusually lengthy and difficult compounds are met with. Typical compounds in a passage may be written on the black-board with their dissolutions and names. It must here be borne in mind that compounds can be mastered more by constant practice in their dissolution than

by rules. In short, the linguistic aspects to be dealt with in literature lessons are syntax and the form, function and etymology of words. *Etymology of words* is sometimes helpful in understanding their real meanings; yet it should not so exceed its limit as to bore the pupils and spoil interest. The most important linguistic principle that will always guide the teacher is that the distinguishing features of a language are learnt mainly through the imitation of varied and connected models of the best style, and that it is needless for the teacher to account for each and every form of a word or construction with the help of rules.$

Though the use of the Sanskrit medium is predominantly to be made for story-telling, questions, answers and explanations in literature lessons, it is not obligatory on every teacher to employ that medium alone in his teaching. If the aim of teaching is ultimately to facilitate understanding or clarify meaning, it is advisable, in the interest of pupils, *occasionally to make free use of the mother-tongue* (i) for explaining syntactical peculiarities, (ii) for supplying mythological allusions and other incidental information, (iii) for quoting concrete

$ It is worth noting what Goethe says about his own way of learning Latin: "I had learned Latin only through practice, without rule and without system. I neglected the grammar as well as the rhetoric; everything seemed to come naturally to me. I retained the words, their formations and transformations in my ear and in my mind, and I employed the language with ease for writing and talking.

Quoted by Jespersen: 'How to teach a Foreign Language.'

illustrations from life, (iv) for elucidating abstract ideas, and (v) for comparing and contrasting idiomatic usages and colloquial expressions in Sanskrit with the corresponding ones in the mother-tongue. At such places free translation should be preferred to the literal one. Recourse will, however, be had to literal translation when a Sanskrit sentence might be very difficult or might contain a linguistic peculiarity. While thus making a rytional use of 'Translation,' more attention will have to be paid to the idiom of the mother-tongue, so that the translated matter would read like an original passage in the mother-tongue. The translation of a बहुव्रीहि compound, for instance, into a complete sentence is always to be preferred to the literal translation of the same. Every care must, however, be taken to see that the translation is faithful to the original Sanskrit passage, and not merely the sum and substance of it.

(g) *Recapitulation*—Thus after the detailed study of a 'literature' lesson from the viewpoint of ideas and language, the teacher should recapitulate the whole in a few sentences for creating a *synthetic impression* of the same. This recapitulation is just like the 'तात्पर्यकथन' of Shastris, who tell the purport (तात्पर्य) of the matter taught at the end of their lessons. A topic can be recapitulated by asking questions to pupils or by 'telling'. The teacher may, therefore, resort either to questions or 'telling' at his discretion. This तात्पर्य *or recapitulation is, however, useful only in 'prose' lessons.* If

it is adopted in 'poetry' lessons, it mars the poetic beauty. This recapitulation of the subject-matter may be followed by a second reading of the lesson by the teacher, if necessary.

III APPLICATION

After recapitulation the 'application' stage begins. Here, various 'language exercises' based on the matter of the text are to be attempted by pupils as 'fixing devices.' There are several exercises that are introduced at this stage. The teacher may devise varied and new exercises; or according to the nature of the textual matter, the capacity of pupils and the time at his disposal he may choose any one of the following exercises:—

(1) The reading of a story, etc., or dramatization of a dialogue *by pupils* is a kind of 'application exercise' calculated to fix in their minds the language of the text in its connected form. At the end of a 'revision' lesson pupils may be asked to reproduce the story orally in Sanskrit. If questioning has been well conducted in previous lessons, the reproduction of the story by pupils proves very successful.

(2) Words in the singular number may be changed into the plural, and *vice versa*.

(3) Verbs in the present tense may be changed into the past or future and *vice versa*.

(4) Words in the first person may be changed into the second or third, and *vice versa*.

N. B. In exercises 2,3 and 4 it is necessary to see whether the changes made are possible and sensible according to their context. Particular Sanskrit sentences selected for changes may then be repeated with the above changes.

(5) Active constructions may be changed into passive ones, and *vice versa*. This exercise can be attempted in the case of isolated sentences.

(6) Subordinate clauses are changed into co-ordinate ones, and *vice versa*.

(7) Synthesis of sentences may be attempted by making use of यदि, यावत्, यत्, यतः, चेत् etc., or of क्त्वान्तs, ल्यबन्तs and तुमुन्नन्तs.

(8) A complex event may be separated into its component parts or a series of actions, in the manner of the 'linguistic series' given by F. Gouin in 'The Art of Teaching and Studying Languages.'

(9) Synonyms of a word as are scattered in different lessons of the text may be collected by pupils. In addition to this exercise the अमरकोश may be used for finding out other synonyms.

(10) Particular sentences may be given for 'transformation'. Pupils may be asked to express each of such sentences in as many ways as possible. Here, the Sanskrit explanation given previously by the teacher becomes helpful.

(11) Pupils may decline and conjugate important nouns and verbs in the passage studied. In the conjugation of verbs pupils should use suitable pronouns as subjects before verbs.

(12) Pupils may collect scattered examples of the same syntactical peculiarity from various lessons. Each peculiarity may be taken at a time. A separate page in the note-book should be reserved by pupils for collecting sentences containing the same peculiarity. In this way different pages may be devoted to different peculiarities.

(13) 'Substitution tables' in Sanskrit may be constructed on the lines laid down by H. E. Palmer in his '100 Substitution Tables'. Such tables may be used as application exercises.

(14) Crude forms of nouns (प्रातिपदिकs) may be given, and pupils may tell their genders.

(15) Pupils may fill in the gaps in sentences by using appropriate words or phrases.

(16) Pupils may use present, past, future and potential passive participles (शतृ, शानच्, क्त, क्तवतु, तव्यत्, अनीयर् etc.) for finite verbs in sentences.

(17) Genitive or locative absolutes may be used in sentences containing the words यदा–तदा, यद्यपि–तथापि etc. Care must be taken to see that the subject in the absolute construction is different from that in the principal sentence.

(18) Various compounds (समासs) of separate words in sentences may be formed.

(19) सन्धिs of separate words in sentences may be formed, or words joined with सन्धिs may be split.

(20) An exercise for 'translation into Sanskrit' may be given. For this purpose, sentences or a passage should be so composed in the mother-tongue that the pupils would be required to use in their Sanskrit translation the same syntactical peculiarities as already learnt by them in the text.

N. B.—All exercises are to be conducted *through the medium of Sanskrit*. Of course, for many of the above exercises the teacher should select complete sentences from the text rather than disconnected words.

CONCLUDING REMARKS—

Proper understanding of literature depends much on the knowledge of idiom and syntax, which must be explained by the teacher inductively in the context of the text. This procedure need not be supposed to be a *promiscuous mixing* of grammar and literature in one lesson, since syntax and idiom cannot be explained and understood except in the proper context of literature. *This is why Shastris* explain कारकs and प्रयोगs,† the syntactical parts of

---

† प्रयोगाः (३) कर्तृकर्मक्रियायुक्तः प्रयोगः स्यात्सकर्मकः ।
अकर्मकः कर्मशून्यः कर्मद्वन्द्वो द्विकर्मकः ॥

grammar, side by side with literature rather than in an isolated manner. Furthermore, *'syntax' must be distinguished from 'accidence'* (declension and conjugation) which may admit of treatment independent of the context of literature.

But unlike Shastris the followers of the Grammar-translation method in secondary schools are found to devote their time and energy more to accidence than to syntax, more to the conjugation of verbs than to the verbal derivatives, more to the second group of conjugations than to the first group, and more to the formation of nouns and verbs than to their ready-made forms. While attempts are being made to popularize the study of English through the Basic Vocabulary, short-sighted Sanskrit teachers do not as yet condescend to realize the urgency of minimizing the burden of unnecessary grammatical portions and making *grammar subservient to the teaching of literature.* If Sanskrit is to be popularized, the idea of Basic Sanskrit will have to be worked out. If, again, practical approach to grammar is to be made in the interest of average pupils, the irrational order

(b) प्रयोगाः पञ्चविधाः । सकर्मकोऽकर्मकः कर्मणि भावे द्विकर्मकश्चेति भेदात् । सकर्मकप्रयोगो यथा—कृष्णो भक्तान् रक्षति ॥१॥ अकर्मकप्रयोगो यथा—कृष्णस्ति-ष्ठति ॥२॥ कर्मणि प्रयोगो यथा—विष्णुना प्रपञ्चः क्रियते ॥३॥ भावे प्रयोगो यथा—कृष्णेन स्थीयते ॥४॥ द्विकर्मकप्रयोगो यथा—यो धरामश्वं दुदोह ॥५॥

—समासचक्रम् ।

of grammatical portions, as above, will have to be reversed, and an appropriate measure of attention will have to be paid to syntax, verbal derivatives, formation of the first group of conjugations and the ready-made forms of regular nouns and of some verbs of the second group.

Up to this time Apte's Guide to Sanskrit Composition has been prescribed in the school course for the study of syntax; but despite the fact that it is an indispensable guide to Sanskrit teachers in the teaching of syntax, it is beyond the capacity of average pupils in respect of language, treatment and difficult examples from classical literature. Students cannot, therefore, proceed further than understand imperfectly a few first lessons of this book, and are generally left in the dark about Sanskrit syntax and idiomatic use of the language. Another mistaken policy in this respect is to divorce the teaching of syntax through this book from the regular study of literature. Sanskrit teachers may here be well advised to use this book for their own constant reference, and revive their knowledge of Sanskrit idiom and syntax. Instead of teaching this book in the class they may utilize the information contained in it for pointing out syntactical peculiarities in the proper context of literature actually studied by pupils in the class. For introducing 'Sanskrit composition' in schools and colleges on systematic lines, the latter part of this book is a valuable guide. But this part is rarely read either by teachers or by students! In

short, the information in this book should be made subservient to the teaching of Sanskrit literature and composition. The natural result of all the malpractice described above is that pupils are kept away from real literature, and even after the completion of their school course they are unable to tackle the meaning of a normal Sanskrit passage! The learning of Sanskrit thus defeats its own end! On the other hand, pupils taught by the 'पाठशाला' method, as the Shastris assure, are able to construe by themselves passages of normal style from the पञ्चतन्त्र or the हितोपदेश and from the रामायण and the महाभारत, after the intensive study of only *one canto* from any of the five महाकाव्यs. Nay, they can attain as much proficiency in literature (व्युत्पन्नता) as a graduate can, *only in four years* which are ordinarily required for completing the course preliminary to the study of शास्त्रs. The point, therefore, that needs reiteration is that the teaching of syntax in the proper context of literature must receive due attention.

SYLLABUS IN SANSKRIT

I

After observing and comparing in detail the courses in different subjects prescribed at present in various पाठशालाs and Sanskrit colleges all over India, we have been able to ascertain that the course in Literature (व्युत्पत्ति and साहित्य) is not stand-

ardized, but varies in point of duration and the relative importance attached in it to grammar. In spite of this difference, it is possible to note in it the common features, which will lead us to standardization.

Generally the course in literature extends over a period varying from four to six years. We can, therefore, safely deduce that approximately five years are quite sufficient for acquiring mastery of the language. In the 'course' of four years' duration the मध्यकौमुदी is studied for the knowledge of grammar, and it really serves all the practical needs of those who do not want merely to specialize in grammar, but desire to devote their attention to the special study of one of the several शास्त्रs like the न्याय, the मीमांसा or the वेदान्त. If the course is extended to five or six years, the सिद्धान्तकौमुदी is generally studied for the last two or three years, which are required for finishing the major portion of that work. In the four years' course the मध्यकौमुदी is generally studied in the second or third year, either simultaneously with literature or after the reading of a fair amount of it for three years. In the course lasting for five or six years the लघुकौमुदी is taught by some Shastris in the second year after the learning of preliminary grammar (रूपावलि, समासचक्र, etc.) and a few cantos from a महाकाव्य, the सिद्धान्तकौमुदी being taught in the last two or three years, as indicated above. Here, the लघुकौमुदी is taught with the view of acquainting the pupil with the Paninian terminology

in a broad outline; but this teaching of the लघुकौमुदी is not prevalent all over India. Many Shastris are inclined to exclude the लघुकौमुदी from the six years' course and teach the सिद्धान्तकौमुदी after the study of the पञ्चमहाकाव्यs. In any case we find that *the study of grammar 'as a science' is mostly not commenced unless pupils have studied a sufficient amount of literature.* In some parts of India (Bengal and N. India) setting aside the difficult treatment of the Paninian system in the कौमुदीs, simpler grammatical treatises like the कातन्त्र (कलाप), सारस्वत or मुग्धबोध are widely used, since they are specially designed for those who want to learn *grammar as a means to the study of literature.* Cases, however, are not rare where pupils could study literature and even शास्त्रs, only with the minimum of grammatical knowledge of the ready-made forms of nouns and verbs, case-relations (कारक) and compounds (शब्दरूपावलि, धातुरूपावलि and समासचक्र). This clearly indicates that *all Shastris were not necessarily* वैयाकरणs (specialists in grammar), even though they were proficient in Literature or other शास्त्रs; and this state of things well accounts for the existence of amusing सुभाषितs purporting the censure* of grammarians by the

* (अ) सूत्रैः पाणिनिनिर्मितैर्बहुतरैर्निष्पाद्य शब्दावलिं
वैकुण्ठस्तवमक्षमा रचयितुं मिथ्याश्रमाः शाब्दिकाः ॥

(आ) प्रायः काव्यैर्गमितवयसः पाणिनीयाम्बुराशेः
सारज्ञस्याप्यपरिकलितन्यायशास्त्रस्य पुंसः ।
वादारम्भे वदितुमनसो वाक्यमेकं सभायां
प्रज्ञा जिह्मा भवति कियती पश्य कष्टामवस्थाम् ।

नैयायिकs and मीमांसकs, and the retort† of the वैयाकरणs to both of them. Those who lay undue stress on the teaching of grammar in English schools should note this fact.

The different types of literature studied in the पाठशालाs are poetry, prose, drama and चम्पूs. In 'poetry' five or six cantos from each of the पञ्चमहाकाव्यs (रघुवंश, कुमारसम्भव, किरातार्जुनीय, शिशुपालवध and नैषध) are studied; in 'prose' fables and romances like the हितोपदेश, पञ्चतन्त्र, दशकुमारचरित, हर्षचरित and कादम्बरी are read; in 'drama' four or five select plays are prescribed, the choice mostly falling on the वेणीसंहार, मृच्छकटिक, शाकुन्तल, उत्तररामचरित and मुद्राराक्षस; and the 'mixed types' of literature like the भारतचम्पू, विश्वगुणादर्शचम्पू, etc., which are more difficult than other types, are taught at the end. Thorough understanding of the above representatives of Classical Sanskrit is mostly coupled with appreciation, for which a standard work on poetics like the चन्द्रालोक, कुवलयानन्द, साहित्यदर्पण or काव्यप्रकाश is studied at the advanced stage. The dangers of narrow specialization are avoided in this literary course by prescribing along with literature (साहित्य) manuals (प्रकरणग्रन्थs) on the न्याय, मीमांसा and वेदान्त as the तर्कसङ्ग्रहदीपिका or सिद्धान्तमुक्तावलि, अर्थसङ्ग्रह or आपदेवी and वेदान्तसार, वेदान्तपरिभाषा or पञ्चदशी.

(इ) नैयायिका वा ननु शाब्दिका वा त्रयीशिरःसु श्रमशालिनो वा।
वादाहवे बिभ्रति जैमिनीयन्यायोपरोधे सति मौनमुद्राम्॥

† शब्दशास्त्रमनधीत्य यः पुमान् वक्तुमिच्छति वचः सभान्तरे।
बन्द्धुमिच्छति वने मदोत्कटं हस्तिनं कमलनालतन्तुना॥

respectively, which maintain the principles of continuity and correlation of studies, and pave the way for specialization in different शास्त्रs at the higher stage. For the first four or five years this course in literature is common to all pupils alike, and is followed by special courses in शास्त्रs for four or five years more.

From the psychological point of view this course is not much faulty except in the case of proper gradation. As literature prominently appeals to senses and emotions, its reading at the lower stages, as designed by the Shastris, is quite suited to the capacities of young pupils. Yet attention must be paid by them to the necessity of prescribing easy books at the elementary stage and approach to more difficult works must be gradual. Here, the Shastris seem to have almost ignored the reading of the रामायण and the महाभारत which have greatly influenced the whole of the later literature in its ideas and form, and the language of which is more natural, living and suited to the capacities of beginners than that of the latter. Perhaps, the Shastris do not think it desirable to place before their pupils the language of the great epics, as it deviates from the rules of पाणिनि at some places. Such deviations, however, not being rare even in the literature written after पाणिनि, there is no adequate reason why selections from the रामायण and the महाभारत should not be studied in the beginning, before the study of the पञ्चमहाकाव्यs. Again, in a few cases, the early beginning of the study of

grammar *as a science* makes the curriculum of the पाठशालाs more logical than psychological, and hence unsuited to the capacities of children; yet this practice is not current everywhere. Broadly speaking, this curriculum in literature is more psychological than logical, and is made more logical only at the advanced stage. It being, moreover, concentrated, there is almost no wastage which is found in the University curriculum. *Within the period of four or five years a student of the* पाठशाला *masters much more Sanskrit than a graduate can* within double the time allotted to it in the universities. One thing must be borne in mind here that the pupils of पाठशालाs and Sanskrit colleges belong mostly to advanced classes, learn Sanskrit for its own sake, and have to study nothing but Sanskrit throughout their course; whereas in English schools and colleges Sanskrit is taught as one among many subjects in the curriculum to the pupils of all classes without any distinction.

Nowadays in पाठशालाs and Sanskrit colleges, exclusive use of the 'Lecture Method' is made everywhere in teaching, and the ancient method of खण्डान्वय has ceased to be employed. Generally the medium of instruction in them is the mother-tongue at the elementary and intermediate stages, and Sanskrit in some cases at the advanced stage. Side by side with Sanskrit explanation at the advanced stage, Sanskrit commentaries of original works are sometimes read in the class, so as to encourage students to read them independently and get their

This grammar should generally be taught on inductive lines, the deductive method being resorted to in a few inevitable cases (viz., numerals, declension of nouns ending in consonants, and some conjugations of the second group), where there is an ultimate saving of time and energy. The thorough learning of the *ready-made forms* of nouns in the शब्दरूपावलि may be recommended, since it is the most effective and time-honoured way of learning necessary grammar. In the learning of similar grammatical forms, use of analogy (in the forms of words) may advantageously be made. *More stress should be laid on the teaching of case-usages* (कारक), *compounds and syntax than on that of verbs and their formation with the help of rules.* We must remember here that Sanskrit literature is distinguished for its Nominal rather than for the Verbal Style. It is, therefore, necessary to

---

indicated above should be thorough and accurate, so that a student should find no hesitation in answering any question in them. A few rules of कारक (cases Govt.) should be added from Apte's Guide or the Kaumudi. Along with these, I would continue the reading of Hitopadesh-not continuous-but selected portions and learning by heart the important verses therein which improves Sanskrit composition. Care should be taken that whatever the boys know, they know it thoroughly and definitely. It matters not if they omit the complicated portions of Grammar; but they must be able to thoroughly answer the ordinary questions."

—लो. टिळक यांच्या आठवणी व आख्यायिका, खंड २ रा,
पृ. २०६–२०९.

economize the labour of the datailed teaching of verbs. Frequent conjugations, tenses, moods, verbal derivatives (present, past, future and potential participles) and nominal derivatives with important nominal suffixes may be taught inductively in the proper context of literature, using discretion in differentiating forms for recognition from those for formation. In the examination papers, questions on grammar should consist of exercises in syntax, i. e., exercises in substitution, synthesis, transformation, change of voice and use of grammatical forms in *sentences* rather than the isolated forms of words..

Here those, who object to the learning of ready-made grammatical forms and favour the teaching of their detailed formations with the help of rules, assert that training the pupils in the habit of accounting for the grammatical forms of words met with in the language, awakens thought in them and thus has a high educational value. From the logical point of view all this is well and good only in the case of intelligent and advanced students; but psychological considerations hardly allow us to agree with these people. As modern psychology propounds, the treatment of a subject in the case of beginners or young pupils must be psychological rather than logical, if it should awaken intrinsic interest in the subject and love for it. Undoubtedly, awakening of thought among pupils must always be kept in view by a teacher; yet it ought to be an end rather than a means. Every conscientious teacher

attending to the instincts, individual differences and needs of pupils must bear in mind that thought can be awakened gradually and not prematurely. Although the purely deductive method of teaching the grammatical formation of words might be the only scientific method from the adult point of view, long experience has sufficiently proved it to be laborious and disgusting in the eyes of young pupils. Of course, the learning of readymade grammatical forms is much less laborious and more economical than the formation of words with the help of rules. Again, in the teaching of grammar, the empiric method, which proceeds from the particular to the general, from the concrete to the abstract, or from examples to the rule, and which, if properly organized, develops into the 'Inductive Method', is not only far from being unscientific, but it positively conduces to the pupils' interest, better understanding and gradual awakening of thought.

We are at a loss to understand why the learning of ready-made forms in the रूपावलि, the speedy means of learning Sanskrit, should be so much disfavoured by some. If it be supposed that the repetition of words in the रूपावलि is mechanical, the same charge can be laid upon abstract grammatical rules which the pupils learn by heart with little understanding. According to the modern principles of language-study a language can be better learnt by use and intelligent repetition than by rules. If this principle is translated into practice, there should be no objection to the learning of ready-

made forms in the रूपावलि. We aver that reputed Shastris are in perfect agreement with us on this point, and that the शब्दरूपावलि can very well serve the need of those pupils who want to be early introduced to Sanskrit literature. Moreover, old manuscripts of शब्दरूपावलिs belonging to the beginning of the 17th centry A. D., are extant and testify to the fact that the practice of teaching ready-made forms of nouns is current among us at least for three hundred years. Again, it is heard that there are Jain manuscripts of शब्दरूपावलिs and धातुरूपावलिs, which are still older than those mentioned above. It may, therefore, be concluded that this practice might not have continued for so long a period, unless it had been of utility and advantage. It may be suggested in passing that while learning by heart the शब्दरूपावलि, irregular nouns of rare occurrence may safely be dropped.

Some people being led by philological and etymological considerations and influenced by यास्क's principle that nouns in the language are derived from roots, lay undue stress on the teaching of verbs in the 'school course'. But what is the good of carrying average pupils, who want something humanistic rather than formal, through the meandering and bewildering process of the detailed formation of verbs? To enable pupils to account for verbal forms in the light of rules, so as to encourage thought, might possess a high educational value in the opinion of some people; but this is a process involving ratiocination and is suitable only for the

pupils that have reached the conceptual level. We must here admit that some tenses and moods are simpler and more useful than others. Yet it is advisable, for all practical purposes, to observe a clear distinction between detailed formation and recognition, and to acquire mastery over important portions. For instance, the Second Group of Conjugations, Perfect (third person only), Aorist, etc., should be reserved for recognition only, as they are found difficult by average pupils. If, however, the claims of etymology as furthering the cause of the mother-tongue be strongly put forth, the following compromise may be effected.

As the roots of the First Group of Conjugations far outnumber those of the Second Group and are more frequent in literature, they are more important than the latter.$ The verbs of the 'second group' may be broadly learnt for recognition; yet for some of the verbs of that group, verbs of the

---

$ According to the धातुपाठ of पाणिनि the number of roots in each of the two groups is as follows:—

First Group		Second Group	
Conj.	No.	Conj.	No.
1	1035	2	72
4	140	3	24
6	156	5	35
10	410	7	25
	——	8	10
	1741	9	61
			——
			227

Thus the total number of roots in the Sanskrit language is 1968.

'first group' having the same meaning may be used by pupils in their composition. For all these reasons *the formation of the verbs of the First Group,* which is also comparatively easy, may be advantageously taught in four or five lessons with the help of rules, so as to give pupils the idea that many words in Sanskrit and तत्सम words in the mother-tongue can be derived from Sanskrit roots. It may incidentally be remarked here that the 'first group' of conjugations can be taught inductively and in a manner more simplified, organized and synthetic than in that adopted at present. This teaching of the 'first group' will further prepare ground for the teaching of verbal derivatives, which are more important and frequent in Sanskrit than the actual forms of finite verbs. The knowledge of the verbal derivatives of the 'first group' will stand pupils in good stead while forming, from the roots of the 'second group', participles, which may preferably and idiomatically be used by average pupils for the finite verbs of the same. This is one of the reasons why the 'second group' of conjugations should be prescribed for recognition only. Thus, the knowledge of the 'first group' of conjugations might, no doubt, help one to carry on the etymological study of the mother-tongue. Yet, so much etymological aspect to the teaching of grammar is quite sufficient in schools, and intelligent students, if they have any aptitude for etymology or philology, might give it free scope in their 'college course' as well as in later life. But in the case of average pupils, who generally do

not want to bother themselves about this kind of work, the learning of ready-made forms in the धातुरूपावलि may be recommended without hesitation. Nobody can expect, even if he wishes, all pupils to turn out philologists under the present system. Why should then the majority of pupils, who are in need of the flesh and blood of ideas in literature be ridden to it, without any distinction. and be forced against their will to rest satisfied with the dry bones of formal grammar ? If the whole school course in Sanskrit be framed with the view of developing the tendency of pupils to analyse words and derive them from their root-stems, it is bound to be rigid and tiresome, and the pupils, in that measure, being kept away from the reading of literature, are naturally inclined to bid farewell to Sanskrit. Language-learning in the school course, at least, should be synthetic rather than analytic, if it should be interesting and really beneficial.

In order to give a definite idea of what has been said above in general about the teaching of grammar and to enable one to ascertain what portions are quite necessary for the understanding of literature, it is proposed here to set down in a graded manner fixed grammatical portions to be finished in each standard. Though the portion prescribed for Std. III is very small, the procedure to be followed in it is purposely described in detail, so as to remove vagueness as to how one should proceed at the beginner's stage. In the case of the conjugation of the 'second group' and the declension of irregular words, actual lists of important roots and

words, whose ready-made forms should be learnt, are given. Those roots and words are quite sufficient for all practical purposes. Stress on those roots and irregular words and on the third person of the Perfect will, it is hoped, relieve pupils of the drudgery and tedium of learning unessential things. The other more important or less important portions are indicated at their proper places. The portions of grammar to be done in each standard are as follows—

STANDARD III

In order to create a proper attitude towards the subject and to supply a systematic basis for its learning, it is advisable to begin Sanskrit in Std. III of High Schools. The teaching of Sanskrit should start with complete sentences in conversational lessons on familiar topics, through which the pupils will be acquainted with the structure of a Sanskrit sentence. For this purpose nouns, pronouns, adjectives, verbs and indeclinables of frequent occurrence will be used gradually as parts of sentences for conversation. The inflexional nature of Sanskrit will be made known by introducing in sentences the forms of words in all विभक्तिs in a graded way and by making clear their कारक-relation through actions. The कारक-relation will be the most important fact to be impressed on the minds of pupils and the ready-made forms of 'action'-verbs in the present tense will occupy a modest position in a sentence so as to subserve the कारक-relation. Thus the idea of the

structure of a Sanskrit sentence is to be given exclusively through conversational lessons, by introducing gradually several syntactical parts of that sentence. Of course, behind those conversational lessons there will be a graduated grammatical scheme; yet the lessons will be composed* and conducted in such a way that the pupils will learn the fundamentals of the language without being conscious of the fact that there is a grammatical scheme behind what they learn. After a fair number of such lessons have been finished, the pupils will be acquainted, bit by bit, with the grammatical scheme underlying them. Here, the function of cases (विभक्तिs) in a Sanskrit sentence is the most important aspect to be taught, and first of all, the functions of the nominative and accusative cases serving the purpose of the subject and the object respectively will be well impressed on the minds of beginners. The pupils' grammatical knowledge of the mother-tongue should here be advantageously utilized for comparison and contrast, since the mother-tongue contains the same number of विभक्तिs as Sanskrit, and differs only in respect of the number of वचनs. Then the ready-made forms of words as already learnt in the conversational lessons will be classified and tabulated, with the help of pupils, according to their different विभक्तिs and वचनs. When

* I myself have composed about *twenty* such conversational lessons, which were conducted in Std. III by B. T. students under my guidance in the S. M. T. T. College, Kolhapur, for four consecutive years with much success.

this will be done, the pupils will realize the utility of learning by heart the ready-made forms in the शब्दरूपावलि. After such conversational lessons and the explanation of their grammatical (syntactical) scheme, lessons comprising connected descriptions and stories may be begun. The grammatical scheme that will underlie the conversational lessons for beginners will be as follows—

(a) *Nouns*—Nouns denoting concrete objects and ending in अ (masc. and neuter) and आ (femi.) should be taken at this stage. Or, if they are abstract nouns, they should preferably be तत्सम words (Sanskrit words used in the mother-tongue). While declining those nouns the principle of analogy may be adopted for pointing out the similarity of forms and thus facilitating memory-work. Nouns should be taught in association with the forms of किम्.

(b) *Pronouns*—All the forms of एतद् and किम् are very useful for conversational purposes; yet the forms of तद्, यद् and सर्व in all विभक्तिs can also be taught easily by using the principle of analogy in the case of similar forms. Only very common and useful forms of अस्मद् and युष्मद् may be taught in conversation.

(c) *Adjectives*—Common adjectives ending in अ may be selected. Pupils may be shown that adjectives in Sanskrit agree with the nouns they qualify in case, gender and number unlike those in the mother-tongue. Here, adjectives in the mother-

tongue may be contrasted with those in Sanskrit. Numerals from *one* to *ten* can be taught by actually counting things. Forms of एक, द्वि, त्रि, चतुर् in the nominative case and all genders can be used in conversational lessons and easily learnt. Declension of these in the other विभक्तिs is unnecessary. Adjectives may be taught in association with words like कीदृश, कथम्भूत, etc.

(d) *Verbs*—As verbs denoting physical actions can be taught by actually performing actions, they may first be introduced. Distinguishing features of different conjugations need not be observed at this stage. The present tense and imperative mood (2nd person only) of the ready-made forms of such verbs may be introduced so as to give a broad idea of verbs. Such verbs may be conjugated by analogy, without entering into the details of formation. The forms of कृ (present tense and imperative mood) may be used along with the forms of किम् in questions asked to elicit verbs.

(e) *Indeclinables*— The most common ones should be used in lessons. Concrete adverbs can be taught by performing actions and by modulation of voice in conversation. They may again be taught in association with कदा, कुत्र, कथम्, किमर्थम्, कुतः etc.

From this grammatical scheme of conversational lessons it need not be supposed that the course for the third standard would be made too much grammatical. In this scheme the formation of verbs has no place. The verb in its ready-made form will occupy in a sentence the modest position

of subserving the कारक-relation of several words which are of different parts of speech. It will, therefore, be found that in a Sanskrit sentence inflected words other than the verb—particularly the subject and the object—will hold a prominent position. For understanding those words and their relations nothing more is required than the simpler aspects of the grammar of the mother-tongue, viz., the knowledge of different parts of speech, विभक्तिs, gender, number and person. Pupils beginning to learn Sanskrit must be presumed to possess at least this much knowledge of the grammar of their mother-tongue. Thus the grammatical scheme set forth here is mainly based upon the fundamentals of the grammar of the mother-tongue. Unless it is ascertained that pupils possess this minimum of the vernacular grammar, Sanskrit cannot be begun well. The grammatical scheme given above is, therefore, not at all beyond the capacity of pupils. What the beginners in Sanskrit have here to do, after the conversational lessons are finished, is simply to classify, tabulate and learn by heart, according to विभक्तिs and वचनs, the forms of words already drilled in lessons. This slight grammatical, or rather syntactical, aspect will prepare a good grounding for the study of Sanskrit. Moreover, all the forms of किम् and other interrogative words being introduced in conversation, will acquaint the pupils, from the very beginning, with the typical question-forms in Sanskrit. *Those question-forms are, according to the* खण्डान्वयपद्धति, *indispensa-*

ble to the methodical development of 'literature' lessons through the medium of Sanskrit; and if they are introduced from the beginning, pupils, instead of giving mechanically Sanskrit answers to Sanskrit questions, will give them with understanding and intelligence. As the beginner's stage in the study of Sanskrit is so very important, things to be taught in Std. III have been given here in detail.

STANDARD IV

(a) Declension of regular nouns and adjectives ending in vowels, of the pronouns अस्मद्, युष्मद्, अदस्, and इदम्, and of the first five numerals —The शब्द-रूपावलि may be freely used for learning the ready-made forms of all of them.

(b) Conjugation of roots of the 'first group' (1st, 4th, 6th and 10th गणs-both the पद्s) in the present and past (अनद्यतनभूत) tenses, and in the imperative and potential moods.—This may be taught in detail with the help of rules on inductive lines. The first and the sixth गणs may be taught together for comparison and contrast. Forms of other roots of the same गणs may be learnt from the धातुरूपावलि.

(c) The passive voice and उपसर्गs may be taught just after the teaching of the present tense in both the पद्s.

(d) *Past passive participles (with त), indeclinable participles* (with त्वा, य, तुम्)—Past passive participles may be introduced after the teaching of अनद्यतनभूत. After broadly knowing the rules for their

formation, their ready-made forms may be learnt from the धातुरूपावलि.

(e) स्वरसन्धिs, विसर्गसन्धिs and a few व्यञ्जनसन्धिs; change of न् to ण्.—सन्धिs may be begun after the pupils have been able to recognize readily the forms of nouns, verbs and कृदन्तs, since the knowledge of the grammatical forms of words is quite essential to the splitting of सन्धिs. Examples of सन्धिs may be selected from the 'reader' and rules may be derived inductively from them. It must be remembered here that the knowledge of सन्धिs is required more for splitting than for making them. Moreover, सन्धिs are optional in a Sanskrit sentence.*

STANDARD V

(a) Declension of nouns ending in consonants, and of numerals from 5 to 20.—Formation of व्यञ्जनान्त nouns may be taught in a broad outline with the help of व्यञ्जनसन्धिs. After this the ready-made forms of व्यञ्जनान्त nouns may be learnt from the शब्दरूपावलि.

(b) Conjugation of roots of the 'second group' (2nd, 3rd, 5th, 7th, 8th and 9th गणs).—In the case of all these गणs except the second, formation may optionally be taught; but it may be taught *in a broad outline*, assigning one lesson to each गण. In the case of the 2nd गण, however, no formation should be taught, as it involves many intricacies

---

* संहितैकपदे नित्या नित्या धातूपसर्गयोः ।
नित्या समासे वाक्ये तु सा विवक्षामपेक्षते ॥

baffling the pupils. It may be said in general that the ready-made forms of only the following common roots of the second group may be learnt by pupils from the धातुरूपावलि.

2nd गण—अद्, अस्, आस्, अधि + इ, जागृ, दुह्, ब्रू, विद्, शास्, शी, स्तु and हन्.

3rd गण—दा, भी, भृ and हा.

5th गण—आप्, चि, शक्, and श्रु.

7th गण—छिद्, भुज्, युज्, and रुध्.

8th गण—कृ and तन्.

9th गण—क्री, ग्रह्, ज्ञा and बन्ध्.

N. B.—The number of these roots may be lessened by dropping those for which roots of the 1st group, having the same meaning, can be used.

(c) Past active participles, present participles and potential passive participles.

(d) द्वन्द्व and तत्पुरुष compounds; use of तर and तम.

(e) *Examples of the idiomatic use of* विभक्तिs, *as* they occur in literature, may be collected and their rules may be inductively framed. A small beginning should be made in this respect.

STANDARD VI

(a) Declension of only the following irregular words—पति, सखि, भू, धी, स्त्री, सेनानी, गो, नौ, दुह्, पूषन्, युवन्, पथिन्, विद्वस्, प्राञ्च्, राज्, जाग्रत्, पुंस्, गिर्, अप्, and अहन्.

Ready-made forms of these words may be learnt from the शब्दरूपावलि.

(b) सेट्–अनिट्–वेट् (a broad idea may be given. कारिकाs regarding them need not be learnt); first

future (a broad idea should be given); second future and conditional; perfect or परोक्षभूत (only the third person should be taught, as the remaining two persons are of rare occurrence in literature); important causals.

(c) कर्मधारय, द्विगु, बहुव्रीहि and अव्ययीभाव compounds.

(d) Perfect and future participles; other important numerals (particularly, every tenth one); use of ईयस्–इष्ठ and तराम्–तमाम्.

(e) Idiomatic use of विभक्तिs should be taught as before in the context of literature.

STANDARD VII

(a) Aorist (सामान्यभूत), desiderative, denominative, benedictive and frequentative forms (all for recognition only).

(b) Common तद्धित affixes and feminine bases.

(c) Idiomatic use of विभक्तिs and particles, and other important aspects of syntax. These should be taught in the context of literature as before.

N. B.—It must be noted here that *all 'grammar' lessons* are to be conducted *through the medium of the mother-tongue.*

LITERATURE

In the teaching of literature, use of Sanskrit questions and Sanskrit explanation, in the manner of Sanskrit commentaries following the खण्डान्वयपद्धति, should be made, the mother-tongue being, of course, freely used for explaining abstruse ideas or linguistically difficult portions, and for the teaching of grammar. Students' comprehension of Sanskrit texts may be tested in the examination by asking

them partially to translate into the mother-tongue and partially to paraphrase in Sanskrit like the Sanskrit commentaries (at the advanced stage only).

MEMORIZING

Good and loud reading of connected passages from literature should be encouraged from the beginning; and *select passages from literature should be got learnt by heart*, so that assimilation of language, would be facilitated and vocabulary be fixed. It must be remembered here that for acquiring command over a language the *intelligent memorizing or 'learning by heart' of select passages (prose and poetry) from literature is one of the best means.** The present educational policy of discouraging any kind of memorizing is certainly not wise. Although unintelligent memorizing may be discouraged, there is no plausible reason why intelligent memorizing may not be resorted to as a method of study. In this case, students must be led to know what things should be learnt by heart. They may be encouraged to memorize connected passages rather than disconnected, lengthy word-lists. The mastery of Sanskrit can be acquired more easily by this intelligent memorizing than by 'Translation into Sanskrit', which is an up-hill task for a majority of pupils.

* It is worthy of note what I-tsing, a Chinese traveller of the 7th century A. D., says about the Indian method of memorizing—

"In India there are two traditional ways by which one can attain to great intellectual power. Firstly, by repeatedly

TRANSLATION INTO SANSKRIT

This translation, which is rarely attempted in the examination by pupils for want of sufficient knowledge of Sanskrit vocabulary, idiom and syntax, which results in the mechanical process of putting word for word, and which did not at all find its place in the Shastri method, should be dropped. If the University, with the purpose of testing the students' knowledge of Sanskrit, still requires them to translate into Sanskrit, this translation should not be taught until the pupils have mastered a sufficient amount of Sanskrit vocabulary and syntax. It should be taught only during the last two years of the school stage on the following approved lines:—

In the beginning, an original and connected Sanskrit passage suiting the capacity of pupils may be translated by the teacher into the mother-tongue or English and may be given for re-translation into Sanskrit. The pupils may read this English or vernacular passage silently once or twice for catching its general drift. Two or three questions in Sanskrit may be asked by the teacher to prepare ground and ascertain whether the pupils have

---

committing to memory the intellect is developed; secondly the alphabet fixes one's ideas. By this way, after a practice of ten days or a month, a student feels his thoughts rise like a fountain, and can commit to memory whatever he has once heard [not requiring to be told twice]. This is far from being a myth, for I myself have met such men."

— A Record of the Buddhist Religion.

understood the general drift. Pupils may then be asked to translate the passage mentally for a short time; and while they are doing so, a few Sanskrit equivalents or phrases may be supplied by the teacher at the places where the pupils cannot use proper expressions. Here, the difficulties of pupils must be anticipated by the teacher and solved then and there. After this mental translation the pupils may be led to make a co-operative effort to translate the passage orally. The teacher should now guide the pupils and conduct detailed oral discussion in the mother-tongue on various aspects. Each sentence will now be attempted in the light of the general sense. This oral discussion would comprise the use of particular idioms and compounds, synthesis of clauses, various ways of expressing the same idea, use of participles, particles, passive voice, the locative or genitive absolutes, etc. In this way all important aspects of Sanskrit syntax may be discussed in the class. This oral discussion will be followed by the writing of translation in a connected form by pupils under the supervision of the teacher. Or the teacher should write the translation on the black-board, the pupils supplying sentences of their own one after another. After the translation of the whole passage is finished, the teacher should present the original Sanskrit passage for comparison. In this comparison better expressions of the original will be noted by pupils. Thus two or three periods may be devoted to the translation of each passage. A few such exercises would give pupils insight into the art of translation.

It would be better if the teacher would in the beginning select for re-translation a Sanskrit passage already studied by pupils in the text. This would induce pupils to assimilate the language of the text. After sufficient practice in this retranslation, independent passages in the mother-tongue or English may be given for translation into Sanskrit. Here also oral discussion will play an important part as before.

SANSKRIT COMPOSITION

In the place of Translation into Sanskrit, Sanskrit composition, imitative of the textual language and helping its proper assimilation, should be beneficially introduced in schools. This composition in the school stage should be of the nature of exercises reproductive of the passages studied in the text and should mainly consist of descriptions, stories, summaries and expansion of ideas in सुभाषितs in a graded form. Use of Sanskrit questions should amply be made for the oral development of the theme, and several pupils should be made to repeat correct answers, so as to facilitate their 'written' composition, which would naturally follow detailed oral discussion. At the elementary stage suitable pictures may be used as aids to the oral development of the theme. In colleges free or original composition may be attempted. People, who have never tried such exercises, can have no idea as to how it is simpler than Translation into Sanskrit, more conducive to the learning of idiomatic language, and a sure test of the pupil's knowledge of

Sanskrit. Of course, in examinations, answers to questions on composition will have to be written in Sanskrit. Even if we suppose that students will, as usual, cram such Sanskrit material ready-made from their examination guides, it will ultimately be beneficial and not harmful, since they will learn by heart so much of connected Sankrit matter.

Reform in the Sanskrit syllabus for schools should thus be effected, so that intelligent and average students would both profit by it, would retain the knowledge of Sanskrit, though limited, as the surrender value of their school course, and would use that knowledge for advanced study at home or in colleges.

III

Here, some enthusiasts assert that the teaching of Sanskrit up to the Matriculation Examination will have thus to be adapted to the needs of average pupils, and hence this low standard of the knowledge of Sanskrit will be detrimental to the production of great Sanskrit scholars with genuine 'Classical spark'. They further add that this low standard of Sanskrit will be quite inadequate to the higher Sanskrit studies to be continued in colleges.

The upholders of this view, being taught Sanskrit by the Grammar-translation Method, which is now out of date in Europe, are generally ignorant of the efficacy of the Shastri method even under changing conditions. They, moreover, profess to maintain progressive spirit by advocating the historical, critical and comparative methods or the

scientific Western methods of research in the higher Sanskrit studies. They, however, are so conservative in their attitude towards the methods of juvenile teaching, that they betray their ignorance of the naturál and psychological methods of teaching classical languages, as recently developed in Europe! They are further found to emphasize the use of the English medium in Sanskrit studies! It is inconceivable, under these circumstances, how great Sanskrit scholars with genuine 'classical spark' are to be produced, when the predominance of the English medium is still to be continued at the sacrifice of the intensive study of original Sanskrit works!

Really, the standard of Sanskrit set up above in the syllabus for the Matriculation Examination need not be considered low, if a matriculate, who has undergone that course, would be able to understand by self-help verses from the रामायण and महाभारत, or prose passages of the type of the पञ्चतन्त्र, हितोपदेश, etc. If this level would really be reached, it would be a sound preparation for the higher study of Sanskrit in the college stage. To be true to facts we cannot help remarking that even this level is not reached by the matriculates of the present day, more time being devoted to obscurities in grammar than to the practice of reading and understanding literature. This undue stress on unnecessary grammatical portions dissipates the energy of pupils in attending to non-essential things, obstructs them from mastering even the minimum of the most

essential portions of grammar, and keeps them ignorant of even the basic facts! People, who have no perspective of the things that can and must be known in the school stage, who do not take into account the secondary place and short time allotted to Sanskrit, who have no definite idea of the standard of Sanskrit to be reached in the school course, and who have vague notions about the aim of Sanskrit teaching and the chief points to be more stressed than others for achieving that aim, are bound to take a low view of the syllabus given above. But, if definite views about the problem of Sanskrit teaching ought to be formed, a definite standard of Sanskrit to be reached in the school stage ought to be set up; and thoughtful persons will, of course, agree to our proposed syllabus. It is futile to set up, only in imagination, a high standard, which has never been reached nor can be reached in actuality by average students; and it is certainly criminal to concentrate one's energy only upon intelligent students at the expense of so many average ones, the 'surrender value' of whose study of Sanskrit is negligible under the present circumstances. The *Problem of Sanskrit Teaching is concerned more with average pupils than with intelligent ones, and we here seek to popularize the study of Sanskrit by searching for more interesting, more intensive and more economical ways and means of learning it within the allotted period.* If need be, individual study or special coaching may be resorted to by intelligent students desiring to be

specialists. But in schools as well as in colleges methods of 'group teaching' being more important than those of individual study, it is highly imperative under the existing order to adopt the former ones for supplying the needs of average students. If the aforesaid standard of Sanskrit will be actually reached by average pupils along with intelligent ones, then and then only the aim of Sanskrit teaching in the school stage will have been achieved. The mistake usually committed in setting up a high standard is that of generalizing from the specialist's point of view about average students also, and of presuming what is easy for intelligent students to be equally so for average ones. This mistake is the sole cause of making Sanskrit a detested and unpopular subject.

We shall, however, set aside the case of so many average students, who somehow pass their Matriculation Examination without developing their power to understand a normal Sanskrit passage in prose or verse and discontinue their higher education, being destitute of the joy of Sanskrit literature. We shall now see how higher Sanskrit studies are conducted in Colleges. The Indian Universities resting mostly on the European methods of extensive study have given undue prominence, as indicated above, to the medium of English in Sanskrit studies, though in the school stage the mother-tongue can now be used as the medium of instruction. It is no use denying the fact that this foreign medium has given a serious set-back to

real Sanskrit scholarship or to higher Sanskrit studies.$In order to meet the University requirements Sanskrit text-books with English notes, English translations and English introductions are being supplied in plenty, with the inevitable result that students acquit themselves well in the University examinations by simply reading this English material to the exclusion of the study of original texts. Even if we suppose that Sanskrit texts are read, the attention of students is directed more to the sum and substance than to the detailed study of the original. Thus the intensive study of Sanskrit texts being thrown overboard, sense for the subtle suggestion and beauty of Sanskrit expression is rarely developed among students. Needless to add here that Sanskrit commentaries, which many times illuminate one on important points and help one to enter into the spirit of the original, are rarely read. Why should *partial use of the Sanskrit medium* be not made in Arts Colleges for the explanation of Sanskrit Texts, so as to encourage the

$ "In this [British] system of education the 'place of prominence is naturally assigned to the study of English Literature and of European Science and Philosophy, the medium of instruction for which was English. Indian Classical languages and Indian Vernaculars were admitted only to a secondary place in the curriculum; and as....... the medium of instruction even for these Indian languages was required to be English, it is easily conceivable that not much progress in the higher Sanskritic studies was normally possible under the system."

— Dr. S. K. Belvalkar–Poona Sanskrit College :Prospectus.

study of Sanskrit commentaries among students? Those who know the psychological principle that oral use of a language makes for its unconscious assimilation and develops a proper attitude of students towards learning it, and those who have witnessed some reputed Pandits effectively using the Sanskrit medium in Arts Colleges, will realize the importance of this point. But in the eyes of many educated people, to use the Sanskrit medium for Sanskrit teaching even in the higher studies is 'to flog a dead horse'!

In the Sanskrit examinations of the University those who know English more than Sanskrit are found to gain an advantage over those who know Sanskrit more than English. Students are generally expected to know *external facts* about a text book rather than *the text* itself. Loud and good reading in Sanskrit is scarcely attended to from the lowest to the highest stage; and it is only occasionally that one comes across even University graduates who can read aloud a Sanskrit passage with confidence, flawless pronunciation and fluency. There is very little scope for original Sanskrit composition, and the translation of unseen passages in examination papers, if it can be called 'composition' at all, is rarely attempted by a majority of students thinking it to be a hard nut to crack.

The study of grammar as a science, which may advantageously be commenced in colleges rather than in schools, is scarcely cared for in the higher studies, though the University of Bombay has

recently prescribed three प्रकरणs from the सिद्धान्त-कौमुदी, viz., संज्ञा, परिभाषा and कारक for the B. A. (Hons.) Examination. As the कारकप्रकरण is very useful for the intelligent reading of Sanskrit literature and for correct Sanskrit composition, there is much propriety in prescribing it. There is also propriety in prescribing the संज्ञाप्रकरण, as it serves the purpose of an introduction to the whole grammatical science, though it contains a few सूत्रs, the full implications of which cannot be understood by students, unless they have read the major portion of the सिद्धान्तकौमुदी. But there is no propriety in prescribing the परिभाषाप्रकरण, for the understanding of which many सूत्रs from the portion not prescribed have to be quoted with examples; and even though such unknown सूत्रs are quoted and explained in detail, it is natural for the students not to understand them perfectly and be somewhat bewildered. परिभाषाs are the rules of interpretation having a wider application to many unknown सूत्रs. It can, therefore, be affirmed that they cannot be clearly comprehended, unless the students have gone through the major portion of the सिद्धान्तकौमुदी. This point ought to have been considered well before the परिभाषाप्रकरण was prescribed. Moreover, in prescribing nothing of grammar during the first two years of college education and in abruptly prescribing three प्रकरणs from the सिद्धान्तकौमुदी for the B. A. Examination, there is no gradation or continuity of any kind. We think that students would be more benefited, if the

लघुकौमुदी or the मध्यकौमुदी would be prescribed continuously from the beginning of the college course up to the B. A. Examination, and would be finished by instalments in four years. Of course, परिभाषाs occur in the लघुकौमुदी or मध्यकौमुदी also; yet they can be studied there in the proper context of the सूत्रs to which they apply. Hence the students are expected to understand them at their proper places.

From all that has been said above it will be found that the study of grammar is, on the whole, neglected in the college course. It is not then astonishing that many students are not found to possess an accurate knowledge of the structure and idiom of the Sanskrit language.Thus the University graduates can supply a fund of information about Sanskrit literature, even though they have a little knowledge of Sanskrit itself ! A strange convention has been established at the university examinations that answers to all questions except the one for 'Translation into Sanskrit' have to be written in English ! Why should students be not expected to answer a few questions in Sanskrit composition and not asked to write their own Sanskrit commentary on the portions in the text, in imitation of reputed commentators ? Why should thus the study of Sanskrit commentaries along with original texts be not encouraged to raise the standard of real Sanskrit scholarship ? But without fully judging how Sanskrit composition is easier than 'Translation into Sanskrit,' and how the Sanskrit medium is more natural, congenial and akin to the mother-tongue than

English, every such reform in Sanskrit teaching is thought to be ambitious and unnatural.

At the beginning the intentions of the Indian Universities in framing the higher Sanskrit courses were to train students in the Western methods of extensive study, otherwise named-" the critical, historical and comparative methods." The students were expected to apply those methods to Oriental learning and become research scholars. It must be remembered here that the number of such scholars is bound to be very small, and that the majority of students are more interested in the appreciation of the beauties of Sanskrit literature than in research work. The date and history of a particular author, the sources and literary merits of his work, the relative place and value of that author in the whole literature, the propriety of various readings in the text, the discrimination between the true and false statements of that author, the comparison of the views of different authors, and the interpretations supplied by different commentators—are the chief topics of study, on which questions are usually asked at the university examinations. There is nothing to find fault with them except the fact that undue importance is attached to them in examinations and that the details of those topics are supplied in colleges through ready-made English notes without doing full justice to the Sanskrit texts. This is principally the training in methods rather than the learning of the language and the subject-matter of text-books. Even in the case of the subject-matter, students aer

more acquainted with the views and interpretations of Western scholars than with the traditional Hindu outlook, which is generally discarded as narrow and irrational. Judicious use of the views and criticism of Western scholars must, of course, be made to keep oneself abreast of them and to have a wider outlook of things. But as the case stands, it seems that the detailed and exact knowledge of Sanskrit, as is possessed by the Shastris, is not supposed to be necessary for carrying on chronological researches in Sanskrit literature. The research scholars who are more equipped with the historical, critical and comparative outlook of things than with the Sanskrit language judge what Shastric works or authors of a particular period would be useful for their research in a particular branch, and the Shastris ars asked to explain the definite portions of those works, calculated to be important, to the research scholars, who afterwards build their edifice on all the facts collected. This tendency is, perhaps, due to the importance attached more to the chronology of Sanskrit literature than to the other aspects of its study in the first three or four decades of Oriental research. The *natural result of this undue stress on the Western methods of extensive study is the negligence of the Oriental methods of intensive study*. This fact leads the research scholars to seek the substantial help of the Hindu Pandits, whose intensive study of original Sanskrit works ever enables them to elucidate the niceties of original texts. But for the aid of the

Shastris $ it would almost be impossible for the research scholars to understand difficult Sanskrit texts and to collect the raw material or data of their research work, which passes for 'original work' simply on account of the English medium employed. It is, however, a great pity that the humble Shastris are rarely credited with this research work, only because they are usually taken to be bigoted, ignorant of modern critical methods and hence unable to reach generalizations of wider application. The modern research scholars thus get wide publicity, while the poor Shastris, who help them in solving textual difficulties and supplying material from various original sources, have to remain in obscurity !

With due deference to the modern methods of critical and historical research and with due credit to the valuable dictionaries, indexes, catalogues of MSS., principles of textual criticism, deciphering of

---

$ (a) "They (the Shastris) have a depth of knowledge, which a modern scholar does not possess. They study one subject, go deeply into it, and can give substantial help to modern scholars." —Dr. R. G. Bhandarkar.

(b) "Any modern *Savant* will admit that but for the Pundit his own achievements would have been impossible." —Dr. Ganganath Jha.

(c) "From a purely scientific point of view, it is desirable to preserve living specimens of the traditional system of learning, as long as possible, as they are of distinct interest and can help us to understand many points, which will become real puzzles, when once the tradition is lost." —Dr. Stein.

inscriptions, synthetic literary criticism, etc.,—the modern aids to research—it can be asserted that

---

(d) " How often have I heard Buhler speak most appreciatively of the Pandits who helped him in his Sanskrit researches ! He often said that it was quite impossible for a Western scholar to enter into the spirit of the Shastras, more especially the grammatical and the philosophical treatises, without the help of a Pandit."

—M. Winternitz-Poona Sanskrit College: Prospectus.

(e) " Sanskrit literature, apart from the Vedas, may be roughly divided into the philosophic and scientific portion on the one side, and the poetical and dramatic on the other. As to the latter, I make bold to say, that in the understanding and appreciation of it native scholars can derive almost no help from European scholars...As to the former class, I challenge any European, who has not himself studied, say, the Vedanta-Bhashya, or the Siddhanta Muktavali, or even the Kaumudi under a native Shastri, either to teach it satisfactorily to native students, or even to stand an examination in it himself. In truth, it is notorious that the 'Eminent Orientalists' themselves learnt the greater and more important portion of what they know of Sanskrit in our country and under our scholars. Dr. Buhler knew nothing of Dharma Shastra until he studied it with the late Vinayaka Shastri Divekar, and Dr. Kielhorn knew nothing of the Vyakarana Shastra until he learnt it under the late Anant Shastri Pendharkar ... But this I do say, that for a real appreciation of our Kalidasas and Bhavabhutis, and for a real understanding of our Nyaya and Vedanta and Vyakarana, neither England nor Germany can suffice. You may learn the Rigveda in Europe and America; and I think, indeed, that a European or American scholar has a considerable advantage over us in that department of learning. But as regards our non-Vedic

they have led us to dilettantism rather than to real Sanskrit scholarship.† In the first place, the intensive study of Sanskrit has been shelved and a sceptical attitude towards Sanskrit language and literature has been formed. A mischievous tendency, therefore, that is rampant among many educated Indians is to pin their faith on what is Western and to take at a discount what is Oriental! $ Some Westernized scholars, who pride themselves upon their modern methods, hold the Shastris, the

---

literature, we entirely deny the superiority claimed for, *not* by, our European brethren. And I would add this, too, that as regards our classical literature, the greatest purely European names must 'pale their ineffectual fires' before those of the scholars who have studied Sanskrit under our old Shastris." —Justice K. T. Telang.

† प्रत्यहं विस्तारमुपगच्छत्सु शास्त्रार्थविषयेषु समुपजायमानतया शब्दार्थविशेषबाहुल्यस्य, मर्यादिततया च मानुषस्य मनसो धारणाशक्तेर्बुद्धेश्च विषयाकलनशक्तेर्यथा यथा वृद्धिं समुपयान्ति शास्त्रार्थविषयास्तथा तथा प्रगुणीभवति प्रयोजनमपि कोशादिग्रन्थानाम् । शास्त्रग्रन्थोपस्थितिं प्रति प्रतिदिनमधिकतरं जायमानोनादरोपि बद्धादरं कोशादिकपर्यालोचने कुरुते जनमित्यपि प्रत्यक्षीकुर्महे । —म. म. अभ्यङ्करोपाह्व—वासुदेवशास्त्रिणः—

(न्यायकोशोपोद्घातः)

$ "The belittling of the value of the traditional Shastric learning which was commenced by the classic tirade of Macaulay, and continued by the writings of more than one missionary, was soon taken up by a generation of ardent 'reformers' who, by practice and precept, did not a little to bring the traditional learning into disrepute."

Dr. S. K. Belvalkar—
Poona Sanskrit College: Prospectus.

repositories of Oriental learning, in low estimation, and are indirectly helping the gradual degeneration of real Sanskrit scholarship and precious Shastric traditions. This tendency has nowadays been turned into the policy of rarely appointing Shastris for teaching Sanskrit in schools and colleges, and of depriving them of the Government and public support. It need not be supposed here that all Shastris at present are of the same high calibre as before. But how can the Shastris be expected to maintain a high calibre under disheartening circumstances? How can the degeneration of the Shastris be stopped, unless the attitude of wilful negligence be changed, and unless they are appointed to Government posts? A wide gulf of ill-feeling and distrust thus lies between the modern scholars and the public on the one hand and the Shastris on the other.

Those people, who know how for rejuvenating Shastric learning, proposals were made forty years ago for the establishment of a Government Sanskrit College at Poona and a branch of Oriental studies in the Bombay University, and who also remember how they went to airy nothing on the pretext of the inability of the Shastris to conduct original research work without a sufficient knowledge of English, will understand the attitude of the Westernized Indians towards Shastris and Sanskrit learning. A person with a probing eye can easily discern how many 'original' research scholars trained in Western methods have substantially contributed to Oriental learning and why the Shastris are incapacitated for

any kind of original work! While the Oriental faculties have already been instituted in other Universities and while Government Sanskrit Colleges already exist in other provinces, the apathy shown by people in the province of Bombay to Sanskrit studies is certainly not creditable. Why would Sanskrit be not called 'a dead language', when we thus willingly let it die?

Although the modern critical methods have been useful in the historical and philological research, they have proved insufficient for the intelligent and unbiassed grasp of the spirit of Hindu culture, to understand which the *analytico-synthetic* or *intensive methods* developed in ancient India are most useful. § Again, all the results of the

§ "It is in the nature of things that we in the West must approach the problems connected with Indian civilization by means of modern Western methods. And for our purposes such methods are excellent, as long as our aim is to carry on an historical or comparative study. But they often prove defective when we want to grasp the depth of Indian thought and Indian mentality. The picture is often coloured by western notions......To the historical scholar it is necessary to analyse, to systematise and to compare, and to create exact methods. But every ancient civilization comprises a substratum which we cannot grasp by mere reasoning. We must feel it and we must 'see' it. It seems to me that only the old-fashioned S'astrin here really can help us, we may be Indians or Europeans......What we really want is the S'astrin who is able to tell us how the ancient leaders of Indian civilization thought and approached the problems."

—Dr. Sten Konow–Poona Sanskrit College: Prospectus.

modern research work being published through the English medium are almost lost to the Sanskritists ignorant of English. In the matter of chronology, there has been, as it were, a tug of war between the Western and Hindu scholars, the former trying to establish that a particular Sanskrit author flourished after Christ, and the latter wasting their energy in refuting the arguments of the former, or bestowing a remote antiquity upon that author! When the proper perspective of the research scholars themselves is lost in this overwhelming mass of literature, people interested in the reading and enjoyment of Sanskrit literature and in the appreciation of the literary and cultural value of original Sanskrit works are bound to be bewildered.

Let it not be misunderstood that the Western methods of research are here being under-estimated, and that the defects of the Shastris are being connived at. We are fully conscious of the conservative tendency of the Shastris. This tendency, though it prompts them to preserve our rich cultural heritage, stops them from maintaining progress, and from acquiring adaptability to changing times and the spirit of toleration. Moreover, even though they are equipped more or less with the critical and comparative outlook, on account of their study of logic and allied शास्त्र, yet it must be admitted that they have neither the historical sense in them nor interest in chronology. They are more interested in the minute analysis of literary problems than in their synthesis, though in philosophi-

cal matters they can establish a wider synthesis, and can exhibit a comparative outlook and comprehensive view of life. Removing, therefore, these defects and warding off the danger of the Western methods, as indicated above, they must accept the good contained in them, and learn to arrive at wider conclusions, as scientifically as the European scholars do, in the matter of the different branches of knowledge, such as, history, sociology, textual criticism, synthetic literary criticism, comparative philology, interpretations of the Vedas, etc., though they need not concern themselves much with questions of chronology for want of aptitude. When they can devote their lives to the mastery of abstruse शास्त्रs, it is certainly not beyond their capacity to master and employ these Western methods of extensive study in their own writings. For this purpose, it is highly essential that treatises putting together in a nutshell the principles of those methods should be written by Hindu scholars in Sanskrit as well as in the mother-tongue. Furthermore, concentrated and long-continued efforts of studying only व्याकरण (one of the six वेदाङ्गs) divert the Shastris from the main study of the Vedas; and their perspective is lost in mistaking the means for the end. Let it not be forgotten that *Pandits knowing the essentials of important* शास्त्रs *and establishing their correlation are as much necessary as those well-versed in one* शास्त्र only. Let it still be remembered that the knowledge of the Western methods of extensive study will be of no avail without the intensive study of original Sanskrit

works. In short, *a happy combination of the intensive and extensive methods of study is a desideratum*; and Sanskrit scholars, who, with the profound study of ancient Sanskrit works and the intelligent use of the modern critical methods, are able to wield the weapon of the Sanskrit language, are overdue.

INDEX : A

INDEX : B

Index A & B printed by *B. N. Thakar* at Shri Siddheshwar Printing Press, Kolhapur.

THE PROBLEM OF SANSKRIT TEACHING
[संस्कृतानुशीलनविवेकः]

By

Prof G. S. Huparikar, M. A., B. T.

Pp. 740, Sanskrit Section Pp. 92, Price Rs. 12-8-0

Select Opinions.

1 H. E. SHRI M. S. ANEY, Governor of Bihar:—

It is probably the first comprehensive attempt to examine the Problem of Sanskrit Teaching. You have taken very great pains in writing the book and I wish that the Universities, when dealing with the question of Sanskrit learning, should be able to make the best use of the various suggestions you have made to improve the method of Sanskrit study... ..Your book is perhaps the most valuable contribution made to the discussion of this vital problem.

2 'PRABUDDHA BHARATA' of the Ramkrishna Mission, Calcutta:–

This is a standard work on the subject......The author has done pioneering work in that he adduces a vast, well arranged material for scientific comparison between Eastern and Western psychologies, linguistics and pedagogics. He has taken very great pains to elaborate practical suggestions as to how the task of Sanskrit teaching could be accomplished on a sound and profitable basis ....

His refutation of all types of opponents to Sanskrit learning seems exhaustive and perfect. His solid knowledge of modern psychology gives authority to his contentions which are in great part derived from his scholarly investigations.

Hindu psychology, as pertaining to the sphere of linguistic study, is lucidly dealt with and evaluated...... Much valuable light is thrown by the learned Professor on such vital questions as " thought and language " and the unit of language......The author's practical experience in

teaching Sanskrit for many years lends great support to his valuable suggestions which will prove useful to teachers, students and general readers...We congratulate the author for his remarkable achievement, and gladly recommend the book to Sanskrit scholars, both orthodox and modern.

3 Dr. V. RAGHAVAN, M. A., Ph. D., Madras University, says in "The Hindu" Madras:—

The present work......is a comprehensive and detailed examination of all the questions connected with the actual teaching of Sanskrit... ...The detailed treatment in this book of both the major and minor issues shows the great care and thought that the author has bestowed on this important subject. The author has written this work to demonstrate clearly that the ancient Hindu methodology of study, as embodied in the S'astras and commentaries, is based on sound principles that bear favourable comparison with modern ideas on teaching methods. In this latter respect, his work should be called a substantial production... The additional traditional training in Sanskrit that the author has had, no doubt, fits him for this work of examining the S'astraic and commentarial literature for pedagogic principles... The data gathered here form a highly valuable compilation...... Prof. Huparikar has produced a valuable work which all teachers and lovers of Sanskrit should welcome and utilise in their work of popularizing and rebuilding Sanskrit education.

4 Pandit R. M. SHASTRI, M. A., M. O. L., Sahityacharya, Vedanta teertha, etc. Allahabad University, says:—

It is a most comprehensive and unique work on the subject of teaching Sanskrit. The exposition of the subject in Sanskrit as well as English bespeaks the author's full and equal command over both the languages and bears direct testimony to his thorough mastery of the numerous branches of Sanskrit learning, covering as it does almost the entire field of Sanskrit studies, besides Methodology

in Education. While going through the First (Sanskrit) Part of the book one is sure to get the real pleasure of enjoying a standard classical work written in attractive and impressive style. The Second (English) part happens to be a sort of lucid commentary on the first one. Shri Huparikar's presentation, arguments and conclusion are at once instructive, convincing and legitimate... .. The book is so far the only one of its kind and the superb product of the present century...... As the real torch-bearer in the field of Sanskrit teaching, Prof Huparikar has done yeoman's service to the said cause by bringing out this invaluable book.

5 Dr. P. L. VAIDYA, M. A., D. Litt., Banaras Hindu University:—

It is, in my opinion, a very valuable contribution, particularly for teachers of Sanskrit, not only in secondary schools, but also in Universities. You have done a real service to the cause of Sanskrit. I find the Sanskrit part *Sanskritanushilana–Viveka* a very lucid exposition in Sanskrit. I think it should be placed in the hands of Sanskrit Pandits.

6 THE ADVENTURE OF EDUCATION (Bombay)-......a timely and welcome publication. The author has studied both in the orthodox way of the Pandits and by the Western method...... He is thus qualified to take a comparative view of the Eastern and Western methodology...... The first (part) is written in a compact and lucid style, evincing great command of the author over Sanskrit...The book merits careful attention of all those who would make the study of Sanskrit interesting and popular in schools and colleges.

EDUCATION, Lucknow:—

The second part of the book requires close study. This part shows the learned author's deep study of thɹoblem əp

of Sanskrit teaching. The one chapter on Hindu Methodology of Education is the masterpiece of the book. The ancient methods of approach to Sanskrit Literature have been ably dealt with giving a thorough insight into the matter. The book deserves a respectable place in the Educator's Library.

8 Dr. M. R. JAYAKAR:—

I am sure that the preparation of such a book must have cost years and years of labour and study.

9 M. M. Dr. P. V. KANE:—

Your book must make interesting reading, as you are deeply versed in both the methods of teaching Sanskrit.

10 Hon. SHRI B. G. KHER:—

It is a learned treatise composed with great labour.

11 THE THEOSOPHIST Adyar, Madras:—

The book deserves the most careful consideration at the hands of all interested in the subject.

(१२) केसरी, पुणें :— प्राचीन शास्त्रीपंडितांना आणि पाश्चात्य विद्वानांनाहि हा ग्रंथ सारखाच वाचनीय व आदरणीय झाला आहे...... संस्कृत भाषेचें महत्त्व आणि राष्ट्रीय संस्कृतीच्या संगोपनार्थ व प्रसारार्थ त्या भाषेचा होणारा उपयोग वाचकांस पटवून देऊन त्या भाषेचें अध्यापन किती सुलभतेनें करतां येईल हें या ग्रंथानें श्रीयुत हुपरीकरशास्त्री यांनीं उत्तम रीतीनें पटवून देऊन संस्कृत भाषेची अमोलिक सेवा केली आहे. या विस्तृत ग्रंथाचा उपयोग संस्कृत भाषेच्या शिक्षणाची शास्त्रीय पद्धति ठरविण्याच्या दृष्टीनें मोठा आहे. त्यांनीं अति परिश्रमपूर्वक अनेक ग्रंथांचा आधार घेऊन संस्कृत भाषेच्या अध्यापनाचें महत्त्व वाचकांस पटवून दिलें, व त्या शिक्षणाच्या पद्धतीला शास्त्राधार जोडून दाखविला या संस्कृत भाषेच्या सेवेबद्दल ते अभिनंदनास पात्र आहेत. —ज. स. करंदीकर.

To be had of:— *1. The Bharat Book-Stall, Kolhapur.*

2. Prof. G. S. Huparikar, M. A., B. T.

Sarnaik Wada, Varuna Teertha, Kolhapur City.

Shri Siddheshwar Printing Press, Kolhapur,

13 Dr. S. K. De, M. A., D. Litt., General President, All-India Oriental Conference (Bombay-1949)—

I thank you sincerely for the kind gift of your 'Problem of Sanskrit Teaching,' which has interested me very much. It is written with knowledge and wide experience and I have read it, as a teacher of Sanskrit myself, with profit and pleasure. I agree with most of the suggestions you make, and believe with you that a radical reform of teaching methods, now pursued haphazardly in colleges and elsewhere, should be made. Unless the teachers themselves are alive to this necessity. nothing can be expected. Your book with its lucid exposition will contribute a great deal towards achieving this object, and I wish it a wide circulation.

14 M. M. Principal V. V. Mirashi, M. A., Nagapur University—

I have formed a very high opinion about its merits. Prof. Huparikar has dealt with the subject in a comprehensive manner. He has convincingly shown how the modern conversation method of teaching languages *is not* new to this country, but has long been in use in the form of the *Khandanvaya* method.

The second part of the work entitled 'Hindu Methodology of Education' is the most important and original contribution of Prof. Huparikar's thesis.........He shows how the schools of *Vyakarana*, *Meemamsa* and *Nyaya* contributed to the evolution of this methodology by their principles of *Pada*, *Vakya* and *Pramana* and how all these were systematised in *Vedanta* and *Sahitya*.........This part is intended to serve as a basis for the practical methods of study and teaching of Sanskrit literature which Prof. Huparikar expounds in the last part. He gives very useful directions

about the teaching of Sanskrit, based on his long experience.

Throughout his work Prof. Huparikar has compared Eastern and Western Methodology of Education and shown how the former compares very favourably with the latter. He is not, however, a blind admirer of old things. He appreciates the importance of the historical and critical method which is the product of the modern age, but he points out that this method by itself does not help us in the enjoyment of the aesthetic qualities of any work, for which we must turn to the principles expounded in rhetorical works. Prof. Huparikar's work......has provided a rational basis for the advocacy of the claim of that classical language.

The book is written throughout in a lucid style. It makes a valuable addition to the existing literature on educational methods. I have no doubt that its merits will meet with recognition at the hands of Educationists.

15 Principal K. S. Vakil, M. Ed., F. R. G. S., M. R. S. T., I. E. S. (Retired)—

The author deserves to be congratulated on producing this pioneer work in the field of Indian Pedagogy. He has made a detailed survey of methods of teaching as orally handed down by ancient Hindu teachers from generation to generation and still practised by their successors in Pathashalas conducted on traditional lines, and as expounded by great Sanskrit grammarians, logicians, philosophers and linguists in their writings in later times; and has endeavoured to show how ancient Hindu methodology does not differ very much from modern Western methodology in fundamentals. He has indicated how teachers of Sanskrit, both traditional and modern, can draw on both Eastern and Western systems with advantage and synthesise them into an eclectic system. The work gives abundant

evidence of close and patient research and makes a landmark in the history of Indian Pedagogy, likely to serve as a lamp-post to teachers and other workers in the field of educational research.

16 Dr. A. C. Bose, M. A., Ph. D., Principal, S. N. College, Khandwa, C. P.—

... You have shown profound scholarship and deep understanding in the treatment of your subject, and it has given me much pleasure to find that your English is so fine. I am sure the book is a most valuable contribution to the history of education in India. The facility with which you have written the introductory 92 pages in Sanskrit testifies to your mastery over the language and claim to write with authority on the subject under review.

17 *Prof. V. P. Bokil*, M. A., S. T. C. D., Retired Educational Inspector, C., D., Poona, —

I have enjoyed the reading of this unique publication on the teaching of Sanskrit. It gives an excellent and extensive treatment of the subject. It contains the fruits of the learned author's study and research for over twelve years in the subject.........Whatever he has presented in the book is all tested knowledge and not merely traditional knowledge.

Pandit Huparikar happily gives a detailed treatment of Sanskrit methods in this book. He mentions the steps and devices used by the Shastris in explaining the Sanskrit text in Pathshalas and also the principles of langurge-study formulated by modern writers. The comparison of the two seems to be very interesting indeed; and the author is very rightly proud of the Indian teacher's wo[illegible] in ancient times. The modern principles of lan[illegible] to study correspond very closely with those [illegible] in them, language followed [illegible] ancient Indian Pathshalas.

It is very refreshing to find in this book full details of all the different aspects of language-study, from phonetics to logical arguments .... In conclusion, I congratulate Pandit Huparikar upon the publication of this critical and comprehensive volume. I strongly recommend it to the Sanskrit teacher who aims at attaining perfection in his career. It will certainly find a conspicuous place in every school and college library. Pandit Huparikar deserves the heartfelt thanks of all interested in Sanskrit for this signal and substantial service rendered by him to their cause.

18 The Hon'ble Justice N. S. Lokur —

At first sight such an exhaustive and technical discourse is apt to tax the patience of the reader, but a second reading is sure to take a grip of his mind ....The author has not only dealt with Hindu methodology of education in general and the teaching of Sanskrit in particular, but has compared it with the Western methodology and psychology very exhaustively, with the aid of a detailed review of the main tenets of the Shastras. His approach to the subject is at once psychological, educational, linguistic, aesthetic and philosophical. I am not aware of any other book giving such a comprehensive survey of the ancient Hindu methodology embedded in the Vyakarana, Mimamsa, Nyaya, Vedanta and Sahitya. He has tried to impress upon the reader the necessity of preserving the best traditions of the past. He has shown that both the Eastern Logic and the Western Logic have largely contributed to the development of the general methodology, though psychology has played no small part in that development. In Section XVIII of the second part he has given a very illuminating summary of his discussion in the first seventeen sections, and has given his conclu-

sions therefrom. Those conclusions naturally flow from the discussion, backed by the authorities quoted by him. This has necessarily involved a good deal of critical and analytical study, labour and patience. The chapter on 'reading and recitation' is both interesting and instructive.

Although the second part of the book contains a masterly exposition of the subject of methodology and shows the author's depth of learning, his clarity of thought and expression and his scholarly approach to the subject, yet I think that from a practical point of view the third part is more useful to the teachers and the taught. While the second part deals with the theory of Sanskrit teaching. the third part demonstrates the practical procedure to be employed in actual teaching in the light of that theory. He has there suggested an improvement upon the *Khandanvaya Paddhati* with the help of the Western methods of language teaching...... I hope that if the syllabus and the method of teaching recommended by Prof. Huparikar are adopted, this tendency (to avoid Sanskrit) will be checked and the study of our Divine Language will regain the popularity which it once had and which it so richly deserves.

19 Dr. A. S. Altekar, M. A., LL. B., D. Litt., Patna University—

He has at the outset very ably reviewed the arguments of the Classicists and the Modernists about the utility of the study of Sanskrit in modern time....The most interesting feature of the book is a survey which the author takes of theories of the ancient systems of Vyakarana, Mimamsa, Nyaya, Vedanta, Sahitya etc., with a view to deduce such educational principles as can be found in them, scattered here and there or even merely suggested. This presupposes a deep and wide study of these different

Shastras and a critical faculty to analyse them. The book shows that the author possesses both these in an-ample manner...The book is a valuable contribution to our knowledge of the subject and deserves to be with every educational institute.

20 Bombay University Journal, Dr. G. V. Devasthali, M. A., Ph. D.

Credit is due to Prof. Huparikar for having explored the mine of the sciences like Nyaya, Meemamsa, and Vyakarana and pointed out the importance of various theories as implying or based on sound psychological principles on which sound methods of teaching are generally based. The work is certainly thought-provoking and deserves a cordial welcome.

21 Dr. K. N. Watave M. A., Ph. D. (Annals, B. O. R. I.)—

... This ambitious attempt is timely and praiseworthy and has been carried with skill and mastery over the subject that does ample credit to the author ... It is a labour of love in the cause of our sacred language, the only source of our cultural heritage.

22 The Aryan Path, Sept. 1949. —

... The book is an outstanding and thought-provoking contribution on the subject.

23 Principal R. D. Karmarkar, M. A., Poona —

I must congratulate you upon your having brought out a really informing and instructive work. The treatment is exhaustive and orderly. I am very favourably impressed by your book.

24 Amrit Bazar Patrika, Calcutta —

From a deep comparative study of his subject the author finds the Hindu methodology in no inferior to its western parallel ... The book is un y a new approach to the principles of Sanskrit tea

25 Dr. A. D. Pusalkar, M. A., Ph. D., Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, Bombay. —

By his training both under the traditional and the modern methods and by his firsthand and practical knowledge of the teaching of Sanskrit in Pathasalas, High Schools and Colleges, Prof. Huparikar is eminently qualified to write on the Problem of Sanskrit Teaching.... The eclectic method advocated by Prof. Huparikar represents a golden synthesis of the two (Eastern and Western methods) and shows an improved method of teaching of Sanskrit ... Hindu methodology has been completely expounded and subjected to a thorough, critical and comparative examination ... The book deserves careful consideration by all interested in revitalising Sanskrit, and the author has indeed laid Sanskritists under a deep debt of gratitude.

26 Dr. Louis Renou, Paris University —

... I am fully aware of the great efforts you made to put in a rational and comprehensive exposition all the teaching connected with Sanskrit culture. As such your book will be indispensable for the advanced student and the teacher....I am determined to recommend the reading of your suggestive work among all circles interested in your traditions.

27 Prof D D. Vadekar, M. A.. Fergusson College, Poona—

Your work speaks both of insight and industry. Your training under your revered father in the Sanskrit lore and as a student and teacher of the modern educational theory and practice give you a rare intellectual equipment, which only a few in the field can command. And you have nave the fullest use of your equipment and opportunit mbodied in thesis has been presented with such amn laem. If this material. Altogether your work must futu Your wealth of be considered a

substantial contribution to your subject.

28 Shri K. Guru Dutt, B. A., Director of Public Instruction, Government of Mysore —

Your approach is distinctly original, covering as it does the entire field of the Darsanas for relevant hints. I do not think there has been any thing like it available hitherto. So you are to be congratulated on your pioneer effort. Your cogent summaries of the logical and psychological issues involved, are admirable. They have an independent philosophic value apart from their linguistic interest.

29 The Journal of Oriental Research, Madras —

Mr. Huparikar is to be congratulated on taking up for his special study a much neglected subject like the teaching of Sanskrit ... While it (the book) does deal with historical and cultural data pertaining to Sanskrit education, as also with the different ways in which, from our contact with modern teaching methods, we can improve Sanskrit teaching, the speciality of the book lies in pointing out, by detailed analysis and exposition, how the traditional method of exposition of Sastraic treatises embodies sound principles calculated to be very effective in the mastering especially of advanced Sanskrit learning. ... He (the author) rightly advocates a proper synthesis of and equal equipment in textual mastery and critical evaluation . This (Sanskrit) section not only presents succinctly in easy Sanskrit the discussions that follow in the English section, but contains also a few topics not ouched upon in the English section ... To show that the ncients had an adequate appreciation of psychology and he aesthetic viewpoint, Natya and Alankara Sastras are analysed in actual teaching, the *Dandanvaya* and *Khandanvaya* methods are explained and the value of the latter, particularly from the modern point of view, is

pointed out. Much useful material has been placed before us here from little known tracts ... The last main part of the book is devoted to Practice and gives a number of practical and fruitful suggestions ... There are several other valuable hints given by Prof. Huparikar, but this indication is enough to show that an indispensable aid to the study of Sanskrit Pedagogy has been provided by him in this book. V. R.

30 His Excellency Shri M. S. Aney, Governor of Bihar, (Detailed opinion) —

I am quite sure that the detailed survey of Pada, Vakya and Pramana will help the people to have knowledge of the essential principles of the various Shastras and Darshanas and the method of their study also. It is probably the first comprehensive attempt to examine the Problem of Sanskrit Teaching. I have read certain reports of committees appointed in Bihar and other places to deal with the question of modernising the methods of Sanskrit teaching. I find in your book a middle course adopted in order to retain in the course of studies of the boys what is essentially important in the ancient systems of our philosophy, and also to create in them a capacity to follow the development of modern and Western thought. I am of opinion that unless the system of teaching Sanskrit is modified to accommodate both these things, its study is not likely to be popular. And nothing will be a greater blow to the growth of Indian culture hereafter on proper lines than the neglect of the study of Sanskrit learning by the Indian people. Whatever we have to be hereafter should have as its foundation the culture which we have inherited from our ancestors and which is embodied in the books and Shastras compiled by them. If this foundation is once undermined, all our future growth

in my opinion, in jeopardy. We may drift but not grow. You have taken very great pains in writing the book and I wish that the Universities, when dealing with the question of Sanskrit learning, should be able to make the best use of the various suggestions you have made to improve the method of Sanskrit study. Yours was, no doubt, a labour of love, as you have stated, and I wish to add that your book is perhaps the most valuable contribution made to the discussion of this vital problem.

.... I really think very few persons have given so much thought to that problem as you have done and you have put it also in a very lucid way.

31 His Holiness the Jagadguru Shri Shankaracharyaji Maharaj of Shri Dwaraka Sharada Peeth, has been much pleased to see your monumental work on "The Problem of Sanskrit Teaching" which embodies a wide survey of the Indian and European methods and principles of linguistic and literary studies. The work exhibits an able effort to accept and harmonize the best from both the systems, and it deserves to find a place in the higher courses of the faculty of teaching. The writer's wide studies, erudition, discrimination and clarity of expression make the work all the more readable as well as remarkable.

His Holiness is pleased to send you His best Ashirwade and Blessings of Shri Lord Dwarakadhish.

G. Mahabala Bhatta, *Secretary.*

32 H. H. the Jagadguru Shri Shankaracharya of Dwaraka, Sharada Peeth—

आमूलाग्रमवलोकितः " संस्कृतानुशीलनविवेका–" ख्यो ग्रन्थः प्राच्य-पाश्चात्यविद्याविदुषा दुप्तरीकरोपाह्वगणेशशर्मणा रचितः। ... आङ्ग्लभाषा-भागात्संस्कृतभाषाभागस्त्वद्भुतोतीव संक्षिप्ततरोप्यर्थतो नितरां गभीरस्सरसो

वच्चिरश्च विभाति। संस्कृताध्ययनाध्यापनरीतिपरिशीलनमेवास्य ग्रन्थस्य मुख्यो विषयः। प्राच्यपाश्चात्याधुनिकदृष्टिभिस्सरलया शोभनया च शैल्या विषयमेनमस्मिन् ग्रन्थे परिशील्य ग्रन्थकृदयं नूनमेवाध्यापकगणस्य पन्थानमेकमुचितं प्रदर्शयतीत्यत्र न संशयलेशोऽपि। अध्यापकास्तथा राजकीयाश्चावश्यमस्मिन् ग्रन्थे दृष्टिनिपातं विधाय दर्शितां दिशमनुगच्छेयुरिति समाशास्महे।... इत्थमयं ग्रन्थस्सर्वातिशायी सर्वोपयोगी चेति निश्चप्रचम्। अतश्चमाशास्यते यत्सर्वे ग्रन्थमेनं पठित्वा नूनमुपकृतिं महतीं लभेरन्।...

33 Mahapandit Shri Rahul Sankrityayana—

—इतः परं भूयांसः छात्राः संस्कृताध्ययनरता भवेयुः, अनेके च तत्र अस्मन्महादायभूतानां पितृभिः संरक्षितानां शास्त्रशेवधीनाम् अवगाहने बद्धपरिकराः प्राचीनं वर्त्म अनुवर्तिष्यन्ते इत्यपि सुनिश्चितम्। कथं च भूयसाम् अनेकेषां वा तेषां पन्था ऋजुः अगुरुः, अर्जितं च ज्ञानं बहूपकाराय स्यादिति अस्ति सुचिन्तितं "संस्कृतानुशीलनविवेक-" प्रणेत्रा विदुषा सुपरीकरेण। ग्रन्थकर्तुः सामयिकः अयं निबन्धकदम्बः भूयाद् आदरास्पदं सुधानाम् इति कामयते— सांकृत्यायनः राहुलः।

34 Hon. Shri G. S. Gupta, Speaker, Madhya Pradesh Assembly —

संस्कृतपठनपाठनविषये सुमहदनुशीलनं भवता कृतमिति सुस्पष्टं दृश्यते। ...गीर्वाणवाण्यामेव निहितमस्माकं सर्वं भविष्यमिति मे मतिः। तत्प्रसारणे रतो भवानिति धन्यः।

35 Pandit Shri Raghunath Shastri Patankar, Rajapur —

काव्यादिसंस्कृतवाङ्मयाध्यापनविषयः सूक्ष्मेक्षिकया वितततूलतन्तुवद्विस्तरेण प्रपञ्चितो ग्रन्थकृद्भिः।... आत्मनो ग्रन्थवाचनपरिमाणावधि मन्ये नाद्य यावदेतादृशः प्रबन्धः केनापि विरचितः। ग्रन्थकारोऽयं विषयेणानेन ईदृक्तादात्म्येन समरसो दृश्यते यत्स्वप्नेऽपि न विषयान्तरं पश्येत्। आ शैशवात् कीदृगध्यापनं विधेयमित्यारभ्य प्रौढतमच्छात्राध्यापनपर्यन्तं सर्वाः

कक्षा ग्रन्थकृद्भिः समादृता दृश्यन्ते ।... अत्र प्रतिपादितानि मतान्यव्द-शतार्धं गीर्वाणवाणीं परिशीलयतामस्माकं मनसि भूयो भूयः समारूढानि, परन्तु विषयस्यास्यैतावान् परिणाहो नास्माभिः प्रागुपकल्पितः ।... ग्रन्थकृतां चिरकालिको मार्मिको व्यासङ्गो व्यक्तं प्रतीतो भवति । अध्ययन-काले तदपेक्षयाऽधिकमध्यापनकाले येऽनुभवाः स्वबुद्धिमुपारूढास्तेषां मर्मज्ञतयाऽऽलोडनं विधाय विरचितोऽयम्। अध्यापनकालेऽध्येतॄणां तत्तद्विषय-ज्ञानं सौकर्येण दृढमूलं च कथं भवेदिति ध्यायं ध्यायं विरचितोऽयमिति स्फुटतरम् ।... ग्रन्थकारेणानेन पद–वाक्य–प्रमाणप्रतिपादकशास्त्राणां प्रायेण सम्यक्परामर्शो गृहीतो दृश्यते । तदनुषङ्गेण साहित्यशास्त्रमपि यथास्वं विवेचितम् ।... बहुतिथं कालं परिश्रमभूयस्त्वमधिकृत्य कृतस्यास्य ग्रन्थस्य परिशीलनं संस्कृतभाषाध्यापनकामैः पुरुषैः सुदूरं मात्सर्यमुत्सार्यावश्यं कार्यमात्मन एव हितायेत्यस्माकं साग्रहा विज्ञापना ।... न किञ्चिदपि प्रतिपादनीयमवशेषितम् । सकलो विषयः साङ्गोपाङ्गं प्रपञ्चितः, नोपपादन-शाठ्यं कथमपि विहितम् ।... अतो गीर्वाणभाषाभिमानिनां विपश्चिद्वराणां पुरतोऽस्माकं पुनरेवाग्रहपुरस्कृताऽभ्यर्थना यत्तैरस्य ग्रन्थस्य समुचिता सम्भावना विधेयेति सर्वं शिवम्॥

36 Pt. V. A. Latakar Shastri, साहित्यविशारद, साहित्यालङ्कार, काव्यतीर्थ, **etc. Malvan.**

यत्र यत्र निक्षिप्यते चक्षुरत्र पुस्तके तत्र तत्र प्राची-प्रतीची-स्थितैर्न केवलं नवैः परमनवैरपि पठनपाठनसिद्धान्तैरखिलैर्गाढमात्मनः परिचयं स्फुटं द्योतयन्ति लेखकमहोदयाः सर्वत्र। इमं विषयमधिकृत्यालिखितः सर्वथा समर्पकोऽयमेव प्रायः प्रथमो ग्रन्थः । आलोक्येमं ग्रन्थं ब्रह्मानन्दकल्पमानन्दमनुभवति हृदयमस्मदीयम्। सर्वथा हि गीर्वाणभारती-प्रतिकूलेऽप्यस्मिन् काले सर्वाङ्गसुन्दरं महान्तं ग्रन्थमिमं विलिख्य प्रकाशतां नयन्तः सुरभारतीसमुद्धरणैकस्पृहाः, गीर्वाणवाक्पाटवस्य परां कोटिमधिरूढा

हुपरीकरमहाभागाः कैः शब्दैरभिनन्दनीया इत्यत्र विषये सत्यं मूढभावमाश्रयते संप्रति मतिरस्मदीया।

—हंसक्षीरन्यायेन किमर्हति स्वीकरणं प्राचीनात् किं च विमोहकादपि नवात् परित्यागमर्हतीत्यस्मिन् पुस्तके यथा साधारं, सविस्तरं, सविश्वासं सानुभवं च प्रतिपादितं लेखकेन, न तथा केनाप्यन्येनानुष्ठितं दृष्टपूर्वमस्माभिरद्य यावत्। ---- अतः प्राच्यां प्रतीच्यामपि च वर्तमानान् पठनपाठनसिद्धान्तान् सुचिरं सम्यगभ्यस्याभ्यस्य प्रयोगैरनेकविधैर्निश्चयनुपेत्य हुपरीकरमहाभागैरालिखितेनामुना ग्रन्थेनैषु दिवसेषु प्रायः केनाप्यकृतपूर्वमतिमहदनुष्ठितं संसेवनं सुरभारत्या अतितरां चोपकृतो गीर्वाणवागनुरागिणां गणो विदुषामित्यत्र न नः स्तोकापि संशीतिः। --- प्रसीदतु भगवान् हुपरीकरमहाभागैः संगृहीतान् सुरभारतीसम्बन्धिनः सिद्धान्तानेतान् संप्रवेश्य धियमधिकारपदवर्तिनां विदुषां सपदि समुद्धर्तुमधुना वैधुर्यावस्थामुपगतां वाणीं गैर्वाणीं, सफलयितुं च समुचितया संभावनया सुदीर्घान् परिश्रमान् लेखकस्येति संप्रार्थ्य विरमामः।

३७ डॉ. शं. दा. पेंडसे, एम्. ए., पीएच्. डी., नागपूर. —

मानसशास्त्राच्या आणि शिक्षणशास्त्राच्या दृष्टीनें शाब्दबोधविषयक अनेक शास्त्रांतील प्रक्रियांचें विवेचन करीत असतां त्यांचे सिद्धान्तहि अनुषंगानें सांगितल्यामुळें आपल्या पुस्तकास सर्वदर्शनसंग्रहाचें स्वरूप आपोआपच आलें आहे. हें पुस्तक प्रत्यक्ष सिद्ध होण्यास ५।६ वर्षे लागलीं असलीं तरी तत्पूर्वीचें दोन तपांचें अध्ययन या कामीं लागलें आहे हें वाचकांच्या सहज लक्षांत येतें.

इंग्रजी विभाग हा सविस्तर, माहितीपूर्ण आणि व्यासंगपूर्ण आहे. नाट्य, न्याय, व्याकरण, पूर्वोत्तरमीमांसा इत्यादि शास्त्रांतील सिद्धांतप्रतिपादनाच्या विविध पद्धति, शब्दशक्तिग्रहाविषयीं विविध मतें, त्यांतून निष्पन्न होणाऱ्या

मानसशास्त्रीय आणि अध्यापनविषयक प्रक्रिया, त्यांची पाश्चात्य मानसशास्त्रीय व अध्यापनविषयक प्रक्रियांशीं तुलना, खंडान्वय–दंडान्वय, अभिहितान्वय, अन्विताभिधान इत्यादि पद्धतींचा व प्रक्रियांचा विवेकपूर्वक समन्वय करण्याची आवश्यकता, इत्यादि विषयांचें आपण केलेलें सविस्तर प्रतिपादन आपल्या गाढ व्यासंगाची आणि निराग्रही, निःपक्षपाती व संग्राहक वृत्तीची साक्ष देणारें झालें आहे.

३८ आचार्यभक्त पं. द. वा. जोग, उपनिषत्तीर्थ, पुणें —

ह्या ग्रंथावर जे अभिप्राय आले ते पाहिले म्हणजे ' विद्वानेव विजानाति विद्वजनपरिश्रमम् ' याची प्रतीति आल्यावांचून रहात नाहीं. अभिप्राय देणाऱ्याला अभ्यास करून त्यांतील विषयाचें आकलन करून घेण्याची तरी पात्रता पाहिजे. ती नसतांना दिलेले अभिप्राय हे केव्हांहि तुच्छ समजले पाहिजेत. प्रा. हुपरीकर यांचा ग्रंथ अभ्यसनीय कोटींत पडणारा असल्यामुळें एकाद्या विद्यार्थ्याप्रमाणें अभ्यासला पाहिजे. हा ग्रंथ लिहून प्रसिद्ध केल्यामुळें प्रा. हुपरीकरांनीं शिक्षणशास्त्राच्या अभ्यासकांवर मोठे उपकार केले आहेत.

भाण्डारकरपद्धति, प्रत्यक्षपद्धति, व पाठशालापद्धति यांचें तारतम्य ठरवून व पाठशालापद्धतींतील उत्तम गुणांचें संरक्षण होण्यासाठीं त्यांचा आधुनिक शिक्षणशास्त्र व मानसशास्त्र यांच्याशीं समन्वय करून पूर्वींच्या पाठशालापद्धतीचीच विस्तारपूर्वक चिकित्सा व तरफदारी ह्या पुस्तकांत ठिकठिकाणीं केली आहे ... टीकावाङ्मयांत अवलंबिलेल्या खण्डान्वय-पद्धतीचा पद–वाक्य–प्रमाण–पद्धतीशीं निकट संबंध दाखवून पुनः तिची आधुनिक मानसशास्त्रीय भाषातत्त्वांशीं तुलना ग्रंथांत केली आहे.... पाश्चात्य ऐतिहासिक, तौलनिक व चिकित्सक पद्धती यांच्या मर्यादांसंबंधीं ग्रंथकारांनीं जे मौलिक विचार मांडले आहेत, ते शिक्षणशास्त्राच्या

अभ्यासकांनीं व आधुनिक संशोधकांनीं नीट अभ्यासिले पाहिजेत. श्रीमदाद्यशंकराचार्यांनीं जी समन्वयपद्धति घालून दिली आहे तिची चुणुक पौरस्त्यपद्धति व पाश्चात्यपद्धति यांच्या समन्वयाविषयीं लेखकानें दाखवून दिली आहे. हा ग्रंथ प्रा. हुपरीकरांच्या विचाराख्य तपस्येचें फळ आहे.

३९ लोकसत्ता (३१-७-४९)

मनोविश्लेषणशास्त्र, भाषाशास्त्र, रसविचार इ. बरोबर याबाबतच्य। आपल्या प्राचीन परंपरा व ज्ञानभाण्डार यांचा तौलनिक अभ्यास करून, तर्कशुद्ध आढावा घेऊन, निश्चित व मार्गदर्शक सिद्धान्त मांडणारा, व निष्कर्ष सादर करणारा... हा ग्रंथ टीकाशास्त्रांत केवळ महान् होय... हा ग्रंथ सर्वांगीण व सर्वस्पर्शी स्वरूपाचा असल्यानें तो केवळ एखादी भाषा व तिचें अध्यापन यांचें अगत्य असणाऱ्या अध्यापकांनाच उपयुक्त वाटणारा असा नसून साहित्याच्या गाढ अभ्यासकांनाहि तो महत्त्वपूर्ण वाटल्याविना राहणार नाहीं.

४० नवयुग (२१-८-४९)-द्रोणाचार्य—

...या ग्रंथामुळें हुपरीकरांची 'शिक्षणतज्ज्ञ' ही भूमिका तर निदर्शनास येतेच, पण त्यामुळें त्यांच्या प्रगाढ संस्कृत पांडित्यावर प्रकाश पडतो... या (प्राचीन) शिक्षणपद्धतीवर प्रा. हुपरीकर यांच्या या ग्रंथानें झगझगीत प्रकाश पडला आहे.... संस्कृतांतील विविध शास्त्रें, वाङ्मय वगैरेचें सूक्ष्म अध्ययन करून संस्कृताध्यापनपरिपाटीचे धागेदोरे त्यांनीं बारकाईनें तपासले आहेत. त्यांनीं 'दण्डान्वयपद्धति' व 'खण्डान्वयपद्धति' यांचें जें विवेचन केलें आहे, तें अतिशय मार्मिक आहे. या दोन पद्धतींपैकीं उत्तरोक्त जी खण्डान्वयपद्धति ती अन्वयव्यतिरेकात्मक असून मानसशास्त्राधिष्ठित नूतन शिक्षणपद्धतीशीं मिळतीजुळती आहे असें प्रा. हुपरीकर यांनीं साधार सिद्ध केलें आहे.... प्रा. हुपरीकर यांच्या ग्रंथांतील सर्व

विवेचन साधार आहे. संस्कृत व इंग्रजी या दोन्ही भाषांवर त्यांची चांगली हुकमत दिसते. विशेषतः त्यांचें आरंभींचें व्याकरण यानी संस्कृत विवेचन वाचतांना विशेष बहार येते.... हें सर्वच पुस्तक वाचनीय व मननीय उतरलें आहे. प्राचीन स्वरस्थितिशास्त्राची कैफियत विद्वानांपुढें मांडून प्रा. हुपरीकर यांनी बहुमोल कार्य केलें आहे. त्यांच्या श्रमाचें चीज करणें सर्वस्वी तज्ज्ञांकडे आहे.

41 Dr. E. G. Caspari. Ph. D., Bologna, Italy (English translation of the opinion in Italian published in 'Corriere del Libro') :—

" *Remarkable work on Sanskrit by Prof Huparikar*:— The illustrious author ... aims, by the comparative method, at supporting the oriental methodology with the occidental one in its psychological, philosophical, aesthetical aspects of education ... We can assert that here is an important and scholarly contribution to the greatest methodological questions of Sanskrit. "

——0——

By the same Author

Popularization of Sanskrit.

[*A paper submitted to the Classical Sanskrit Section of the 15 th All-India Oriental Conference, Bombay, (1949)*]

Price : As. 8

Books to be had of:—

Prof. G. S. Hoparikar, M. A., B. T.
Sarnaik Wada, Varuna Teertha, Kolhapur City.